

AL-SUHAYLI'S CONTRIBUTION
TO THE SĪRA

BY
SUAD SID AHMED ALI

Thesis presented to the University of Edinburgh for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Arts
1985



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	page iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vi
Transliteration	vii
Abbreviations	viii-xi
Chapter I Introduction	
al-Suhaylī's life	1-7
His works	7-13
The political situation	13-14
The intellectual life	14-17
Chapter II The writing of <u>Sīra</u> up to the time of al-Suhaylī	18-44
Chapter III al-Suhaylī as a commentator and his use of his sources	45-67
al-Suhaylī's use of Yunus' version	67-87
Chapter IV Legal implications	
Legal questions connected with <u>jihād</u>	89-104
Legal questions connected with prayer	104-119
Questions connected with <u>ṭahāra</u>	114-129
Legal questions connected with marriage and divorce	129-137
Legal questions connected with <u>hijra</u>	137-142
Legal questions connected with ^c <u>umra</u>	142-145
Legal questions connected with things lawful and unlawful	145-155
The validity of one's own <u>ijtihād</u>	155-160
Legal problems connected with testimony	160-161
Legal problems connected with <u>buyū</u> ^c	161-166
Chapter V Theological implications	167-190

Chapter VI	al-Suhaylī's views on Qur'ān exegesis	191
	al-Suhaylī's treatment of the <u>isrā'</u>	231-238
	al-Suhaylī's speculations on the <u>mi^crāj</u>	238-243
	al-Suhaylī's views on <u>naskh</u>	257-265
Chapter VII	Emphases in al-Suhaylī's commentary	
	Historical accounts	266
	The Prophet's meeting with Banū Tha ^c laba	266-270
	Pertaining to the Prophet's mission to foreign rulers	271-280
	The sack of Medina	280-283
	al-Suhaylī's focus on some aspects of the Prophet's personality and practice	284
	How the Prophet dealt with a hostile Qurashite	284-286
	How the Prophet dealt with the Jewish woman who poisoned him	286-287
	Why the Prophet ordered the punishment of the ^c Uranites	287-289
	Some signs of prophecy: Suhayli's treatment	289-290
	The Prophet praying for rain	290-291
	The Prophet's attitude to poetry	291-292
	Why the Prophet was called Ibn Abī Kabsha	292-293
	How the Prophet dealt with Khawwat	293-294
	The Prophet's institution of " <u>wadīma</u> "	294-295
	The wives of the Prophet	295-299
	al-Suhayli's critical emendation of some accounts	299-304
	Linguistic discussions	304-316
Conclusion		317-320
Arabic Appendix		321-344
Bibliography		345-352

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and of my
own execution and authorship

SUAD SID AHMED ALI

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the memory of my father who died shortly before its completion.

To my darling daughter Sālī who has been of tremendous support and inspiration.

To my husband who waited patiently in Sudan for three years for our return.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I wish to express my deep sense of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Ian Howard of Edinburgh University, for his remarkable patience, probing and insightful comments, and continuous guidance, without which this thesis would not have been possible. I am also very much indebted to Dr. Aḥmad^CAlī al-Imam and my fellow research student Roderic Vassie, who both took the responsibility of providing me with research material. Besides the latter's constant help and very useful comments on the initial stage of this research.

I also wish to express my deep gratitude to those friends who have always been willing to look after my daughter so that I could spend more time on my research. In particular I should like to thank the families of Dr.^CAbbās Maḥjūb, Dr. Shaykh al-Din^CAwad^CAbd al-Raḥīm and the family of Mr. Yasīn Ṣālīh^CUthmān.

I also take this opportunity to thank Miss Irene Crawford, secretary of the Islamic Studies Department at Edinburgh University, for her assistance throughout my stay in Edinburgh and Mrs Taylor for typing the thesis. My thanks are also due to my fellow research students and friends, Haifā, Muneera and Norma Livingstone for their moral support.

Finally I acknowledge my debt of gratitude to the University of Khartoum, Sudan, which provided me with a scholarship to pursue my course of study in Edinburgh.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with the work, al-Rawḍ al-Unuf, by Abū al-Qāsim^CAbd al-Rahmān al-Suhaylī 508 - 581 A.H., one of the leading Andalusian scholars who lived during the time of the Almohads. The work is one of the earliest and most important commentaries on the Sīra (biography) of the Prophet, which was written by Ibn Ishāq (d. 151) as transmitted by Ibn Hishām (d. 218).

Chapter I is an introduction which includes a study of the life of the author and his literary and scholarly position. In Chapter II there is a survey of the writing of the Sīra and commentaries on it until the author's time. This is done in order to put the author's work and sources into proper perspective. The thesis, then, examines in Chapter III the author as a commentator and his use of his sources, taking particular account of his use of the version of the Sīra transmitted on the authority of Ibn Ishāq by Yūnus Ibn Bukayr (d. 199). This is followed by a discussion of the legal implications as inferred by al-Suhaylī from the accounts in the Sīra, with special reference to Ibn al-Qayyim (d. 751), who was influenced by al-Suhaylī. It demonstrates that al-Suhaylī, not Ibn al-Qayyim, was the first to use the Sīra systematically for legal deductions.

Chapter V deals with the theological implications that the author discussed in the Sīra, with regard to the events in the Sīra that necessitate such discussion. Here al-Suhaylī's Ash^Carite background emerges. The problems of Qur'ānic exegesis which are prompted by the Sīra are the subject of Chapter VI. Al-Suhaylī's views on Qur'anic exegesis are discussed as far as they are concerned with verses which are discussed in the Sīra or subject to different ways of interpretation.

Chapter VII includes some different emphases in al-Suhaylī's commentary. In it some relatively unknown historical accounts are discussed, besides some examples of the author's highlight on some aspects of the Prophet's personality and practice. This is followed by a conclusion in which al-Suhaylī's contribution to the Sīra is summarised. In an appendix, some excerpts that al-Suhaylī quoted from Yūnus' version which are no longer accessible are presented in Arabic.

TRANSLITERATION

Arabic Letter	Transliteration	Short Vowels
ا	'	َ a
ب	b	ُ u
ت	t	ِ i
ث	th	
ج	j	
ح	h	
خ	kh	
د	d	
ذ	dh	
ر	r	
ز	z	
س	s	
ش	sh	
ص	ṣ	
ط	ṭ	
ظ	ẓ	
ع	ʿ	
غ	gh	
ف	f	
ق	q	
ك	k	
ل	l	
م	m	
ن	n	
ه	h	
و	w	
ي	y	
ة	t	

َ	a
ُ	u
ِ	i
Long Vowels	
آ	ā
و	ū
ي	ī
Diphthongs	
أ	aw
إ	ay
ي	iyy
و	uww

ABBREVIATIONS
used in this Thesis

<u>Abū Nu^caym</u>	<u>al-Iṣbahānī, Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa</u>
<u>Ahkām</u>	<u>Ibn al-^cArabī, Ahkām al-Qur'ān</u>
<u>Akhbār Makka</u>	<u>al-Azraqī, Akhbār Makka</u>
<u>Amālī</u>	<u>al-Suhaylī, Amālī al-Suhaylī</u>
<u>al-Amwāl</u>	<u>Abū ^cUbayd al-Qāsim, Kitāb al-Amwāl</u>
<u>al-Anbiyā'</u>	<u>Ibn Kathīr, Qaṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'</u>
<u>Ansāb</u>	<u>al-Balādhurī, Ansāb al-Ashraf</u>
<u>al-Awā'il</u>	<u>al-Askarī, al-Awā'il</u>
<u>Awāsim</u>	<u>Ibn al-^cArabī, al-Awāsim min al-Qawāsim</u>
<u>al-Bayān</u>	<u>al-Jāhiz, al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn</u>
<u>al-Bidāya</u>	<u>Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya</u>
<u>al-Bughya</u>	<u>al-Suyūṭī, Bughyat al-Wu^cāt</u>
<u>Dalā'il</u>	<u>al-Bayhaqī, Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa</u>
<u>al-Dibāj</u>	<u>Ibn Farhūn, al-Dibāj al-Mudhahhab</u>
<u>Du^cafā'</u>	<u>al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Du^cafā' al-Ṣaghīr</u>
<u>EI¹, EI²</u>	<u>The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st, 2nd ed. respectively</u>
<u>al-Fatāwa</u>	<u>Ibn Taymiyya, Majmū^c Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyya</u>
<u>al-Fath</u>	<u>Ibn Hajar, Fath al-Bārī</u>
<u>al-Fihrist</u>	<u>Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist</u>
<u>al-Firaq</u>	<u>al-Baghdādī, al-Farq bayn al-Firaq</u>
<u>al-Fiṣal</u>	<u>Ibn Ḥazm, al-Fiṣal fī al-Milal wa al-Nihāl</u>
<u>Futūḥ al-Buldān</u>	<u>al-Balādhurī, Futūḥ al-Buldān</u>
<u>al-Ibāna</u>	<u>al-Ash^carī, al-Ibāna ^can Uṣūl al-Diyāna</u>
<u>al-^cIbar</u>	<u>al-Dhahabī, al-^cIbar fī Khabār man Ghabar</u>
<u>Ibn ^cAqīl</u>	<u>Sharḥ Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik</u>
<u>Ibn Khaldūn</u>	<u>Kitāb al-^cIbar wa Diwān al-Mubtada' wa al-Khabar</u>
<u>Ibn Khayr</u>	<u>Fihrist mā rawahu ^can Shuyūkhīhi</u>
<u>Ibn Khayyāt</u>	<u>Khalīfa, Ta'rīkh Ibn Khayyāt</u>
<u>Ibn Manẓūr</u>	<u>Lisān al-^cArab</u>
<u>Ibn Qutayba</u>	<u>al-Shi^cr wa al-Shu^carā'</u>
<u>Ibn Sirīn</u>	<u>Tafsīr al-Ahlām al-Kabīr</u>
<u>al-Iḥāta</u>	<u>Ibn al-Khaṭīb, al-Iḥāta fī Akhbār Gharnāta</u>
<u>Ihya'</u>	<u>al-Ghazālī, Ihyā' ^cUlūm al-Dīn</u>
<u>al-Imtā^c</u>	<u>Abū Hayyān, al-Imtā^c wa al-Mu'ānasa</u>
<u>al-Iqtisād</u>	<u>al-Ghazālī, al-Iqtisād fī al-I^ctiqād</u>

<u>Irshād</u>	<u>al-Ḥamawī, Irshād al-Arīb ila Ma^crifat al-Adīb</u>
<u>I^crāb</u>	<u>al-Naḥḥās, I^crāb al-Qur'ān</u>
<u>al-Isāba</u>	<u>Ibn Ḥajar, al-Isāba fī Tamyiz al-Sahāba</u>
<u>al-Ishtiqāq</u>	<u>Ibn Durayd, al-Ishtiqāq</u>
<u>Islamic Culture</u>	<u>Horovitz, J. "The earliest biographies of the Prophet and their authors", Islamic Culture, Vol.1,2</u>
<u>Islamic Philosophy</u>	<u>W.M.Watt, Islamic Philosophy and Theology</u>
<u>al-Istī^cāb</u>	<u>Ibn ^cAbd al-Barr, al-Istī^cāb fī Asmā' al-Ashāb</u>
<u>Jamhara</u>	<u>Ibn Ḥazm, Jamharat Ansāb al-^cArab</u>
<u>Jawāhir al-Qur'ān</u>	<u>al-Ghazālī, Jawāhir al-Qur'ān</u>
<u>al-Juwaynī</u>	<u>al-Irshād</u>
<u>Kashf</u>	<u>Ḥājī Khalīfa, Kashf al-Zunūn</u>
<u>al-Kashshāf</u>	<u>al-Zamakhsharī, al-Kashshāf ^can Ghawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl</u>
<u>Life of Muhammad</u>	<u>Guillaume, The Life of Muhammad</u>
<u>Lubāb</u>	<u>Ibn al-Athīr, ^cAlī, al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb</u>
<u>al-Luma^c</u>	<u>al-Ash^carī, Kitāb al-Luma^c</u>
<u>al-Ma^carif</u>	<u>Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma^carif</u>
<u>al-Mabānī</u>	<u>(anonymous). Muqaddimatān fī ^cUlūm al-Qur'ān</u>
<u>al-Maghāzī</u>	<u>al-Wāqidī, Kitāb al-Maghāzī</u>
<u>Maghāzī ^cUrwa</u>	<u>al-A^czamī, Maghāzī Rasūl Allāh li ^cUrwa ibn al-Zubayr</u>
<u>Majāz</u>	<u>Abū ^cUbayda Ma^cmar ibn al-Muthannā, Majāz al-Qur'ān</u>
<u>al-Majrūhīn</u>	<u>Ibn Hibbān, Kitāb al-Majrūhīn min al-Muhaddithīn</u>
<u>al-Māliqī</u>	<u>al-Martiba al-^cUlyā fī man Yastahiqq al-Qaḍā'</u>
<u>Maqālāt</u>	<u>al-Qummī, Kitāb al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq</u>
<u>Masādir</u>	<u>Fārūq Ḥamāda, Masādir al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya</u>
<u>al-Māwardī</u>	<u>A^clām al-Nubuwwa</u>
<u>al-Maḍānī</u>	<u>Majma^c al-Amthāl</u>
<u>Mizān</u>	<u>al-Dhahabī, Mizān al-I^ctidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl</u>
<u>al-Mudawwana</u>	<u>Mālik ibn Anas, al-Mudawwana</u>
<u>al-Muḥallā</u>	<u>Ibn Ḥazm, al-Muḥallā</u>
<u>al-Muḥabbar</u>	<u>Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥabbar</u>
<u>Muḥammad at Mecca</u>	<u>W.M.Watt, Muḥammad at Mecca</u>
<u>Muḥammad at Medina</u>	<u>W.M.Watt, Muḥammad at Medina</u>
<u>Mu^cjam</u>	<u>al-Bakrī, Mu^cjam ma Ista^cjam</u>
<u>al-Mu^cjib</u>	<u>al-Marrākishī, al-Mu^cjib fī Talkhīṣ Akhbār al-Maghrib</u>
<u>al-Muntaẓam</u>	<u>Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam fī Ta'rīkh al-Mulūk</u>

<u>al-Muqaddimāt</u>	Ibn Rushd, <u>Muqaddimāt Ibn Rushd</u>
<u>Murūj</u>	al-Mas ^c ūdī, <u>Murūj al-Dhahab</u>
<u>Muslim Theology</u>	MacDonald, <u>Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory</u>
<u>al-Musnad</u>	Ibn Ḥanbal, <u>Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal</u>
<u>Muslim Studies</u>	Goldziher, <u>Muslim Studies</u>
<u>al-Mustasfā</u>	al-Ghazālī, <u>al-Mustasfā min ^cIlm al-Usūl</u>
<u>al-Mutrib</u>	Ibn Diḥya, <u>al-Mutrib min Ash^cār Ahl al-Maghrib</u>
<u>al-Muwaffaḡiyyāt</u>	Ibn Bakkār, <u>al-Akhbār al-Muwaffaḡiyyāt</u>
<u>al-Muwatta'</u>	Mālik ibn Anas, <u>Muwatta' Mālik</u>
<u>Naqd al-Mantiq</u>	Ibn Taymiyya, <u>Naqd al-Mantiq</u>
<u>New Light</u>	Guilluame, <u>New Light on the Life of Muḥammad</u>
<u>al-Nihāya</u>	Ibn al-Athīr, <u>al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth</u>
<u>al-Nāsā'ī</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Sunan</u>
<u>al-Nubalā'</u>	al-Dhahabī, <u>Siyar A^clām al-Nubalā'</u>
<u>al-Qālī</u>	<u>Kitāb al-Amālī</u>
<u>The Qur'an</u>	Bell, <u>The Qur'an</u>
<u>Qurtubī</u>	al-Jāmi ^c lī Ahkām al-Qur'an
<u>al-Radd ^cala al-Mantiḡiyyīn</u>	by Ibn Taymiyya
<u>al-Radd ^cala al-Nuhāt</u>	by Ibn Maḡā' al-Qurtubī
<u>al-Rāzi</u>	<u>Mafātīḡ al-Ghayb</u> , known as <u>al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr</u>
<u>al-Risāla</u>	al-Shāfi ^c ī, <u>al-Risāla</u>
<u>al-Ṣafadī</u>	<u>Nakt al-Himyan fī Nukat al-^cUmyān</u>
<u>Ṣawā^ciq</u>	Ibn al-Qayyim, <u>al-Ṣawā^ciq al-Mursala</u>
<u>Shadharāt</u>	Ibn al- ^c Imād, <u>Shadharāt al-Dhahab</u>
<u>Sharḡ al-Mawāhib</u>	al-Zarqānī, <u>Sharḡ al-Mawāhib al-Laduniyya</u>
<u>Sharḡ al-Shifā'</u>	al-Khafājī, <u>Sharḡ al-Shifā'</u>
<u>Sharḡ al-Sīra</u>	Abū Dharr, <u>Sharḡ al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya</u>
<u>Sharḡ al-Tirmidhī</u>	Ibn al- ^c Arabī, <u>Sharḡ Ṣaḡīḡ al-Tirmidhī</u>
<u>al-Shifā'</u>	^c Iyād ibn Mūsā, <u>al-Shifā' bī-Ta^crīf Huḡuḡ al-Mustafa</u>
<u>al-Sīla</u>	Ibn Bashkuwal, <u>Kitāb al-Sīla</u>
<u>Siyar Ibn Ishāq</u>	Zakkār, <u>Kitāb al-Siyar wa al-Maghāzī li Ibn Ishāq</u>
<u>Sunan</u>	Abū Dā'ūd, <u>Sunan Abī Dā'ūd</u>
<u>Tabaqat</u>	Ibn Sa ^c d, <u>Kitāb al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā</u>
<u>Tabaqāt Fuhūl al-Shu^carā'</u>	by al-Jumāhī

<u>Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssirīn al-Dā'ūdī</u> , <u>Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssirīn</u>	
<u>Ṭabyīn</u>	Ibn ^C Asākir, <u>Ṭabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī</u>
<u>Tadhkira</u>	al-Dhahabī, <u>Tadhkirat al-Huffāz</u>
<u>Tafsīr al-Manār</u>	Rashīd Riḍa, <u>Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Hakīm</u>
<u>Tahdhīb</u>	Ibn Ḥajar, <u>Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb</u>
<u>al-Takmila</u>	Ibn al-Abbār, <u>Kitāb al-Takmila lī Kitāb al-Sila</u>
<u>Ṭālibī</u>	Ārā' Abī Bakr ibn al- ^C Arabī al-Kalāmiyya
<u>al-Tamhīd</u>	al-Bāqillānī, <u>al-Tamhīd</u>
<u>al-Tanbih</u>	al-Mas ^C ūdī, <u>al-Tanbih wa al-Ishrāf</u>
<u>al-Ta^Crīf</u>	al-Suhaylī, <u>al-Ta^Crīf wa al-I^Clām</u>
Ta ^C rīf, MS.	London, India Office Library MS. No.101.
<u>Ta'rīkh</u>	al-Ṭabari, <u>Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk</u>
<u>Ta'rīkh Baghdād</u>	al-Khatīb, <u>Ta'rīkh Baghdād</u>
Text	al-Suhaylī, <u>al-Rawd al-Unuf</u>
<u>al-Tirmidhī</u>	al-Jāmi ^C al-Ṣaḥīḥ known as <u>Sunan al-Tirmidhī</u>
<u>Ṭusī</u>	<u>al-Fihrist</u>
<u>al-Umm</u>	al-Shafi ^C i, <u>al-Umm</u>
<u>al-Uṣūl</u>	^C Abd al-Jabbar ibn Aḥmad, <u>Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsa</u>
<u>^CUyūn al-Athar</u>	Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, <u>^CUyūn al-Athar</u>
<u>Wafayāt</u>	Ibn Khallikān, <u>Wafayāt al-A^Cyān</u>
<u>al-Wathā'iq</u>	Ḥamīd Allāh, <u>Majmū^Cat al-Wathā'iq al-Siyāsiyya lī</u> <u>al-^CAhd al-Nabawī wa al-Khilāfa al-Rashida</u>
<u>al-Yazīdī</u>	<u>al-Amālī</u>
Yūnus	Ḥamīd Allāh (ed.) <u>Sīrat Ibn Ishāq al-Musammāh bi-</u> <u>Kitāb al-Muḥtadā' wa al-Mab^Cath wa al-Maghāzī</u> "According to Yūnus MS"
<u>Zād al-Ma^Cād</u>	Ibn al-Qayyim, <u>Zād al-Ma^Cād fī Hady Khayr al-^CIbād</u>
<u>al-Zajjāj</u>	<u>I^Crāb al-Qur'ān</u>
Zakkār	<u>al-Maghāzī al-Nabawiyya</u> "According to the version of al-Zuhrī"
<u>Zilāl</u>	Qutb, <u>fī Zilāl al-Qur'ān</u>

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an examination of the book al-Rawḍ al-Unuf (lit. virgin garden) by Abū al-Qāsim al-Suhaylī. Although this work is a commentary on the sīra of the Prophet as written by Ibn Ishāq and edited by Ibn Hishām, it is, in fact, one of the main sources on the sīra itself. Thus this study was undertaken in order to assess al-Suhaylī's contribution to the genre. However, before proceeding to the main task, the author of al-Rawḍ needs to be dealt with first, since the acquaintance with certain essential facts of his life and times will give the reader some idea of al-Suhaylī's experience and the opportunities he is likely to have had of obtaining information on the subjects treated in al-Rawḍ.

AL-SUHAYLĪ'S LIFE

The biographers mentioned three kunyas for him: Abū al-Qāsim, Abū Zayd¹ and Abū al-Hasan. The latter was mentioned by a few biographers,² the former is the most famous as it occurs frequently in books of grammar and language. His name was ^cAbd al-Rahmān ibn ^cAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Iṣḥāq ibn Husayn ibn Sa^cdūn ibn Rudwān ibn Fattūh al-Suhaylī al-Khath^camī. The latter referred his lineage to the tribe of Khath^cam, while the former lineage indicates that he was a native of Suhayl; a small village near Malaga in al-Andalus

-
1. Al-Muṭrib, p.230; Wafayāt, vol.2, p.351; al-Dībāj, p.150, Inbāh, vol.2, p.162; al-Bidāya, vol.12, p.319; Bughya, vol.2, p.81; al-Ṣafadī, p.187.
 2. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1348; Shadharāt, vol.4, p.271; Takmila, vol.2, p.570.

(Muslim Spain). He was a descendant from Abū Ruwayḥa al-Khath^c amī - to whom the Prophet entrusted a flag in the year of the conquest¹ - as he dictated his full name to his pupil Ibn Dihya.² According to one biographer, al-Dā'ūdī,³ the name "Hubaysh" appeared in al-Suhaylī's ancestry instead of "Husayn" which was recorded by all the others. It seems likely that he was only confused between our Abū al-Qāsim and Abū al-Qāsim ibn Hubaysh,⁴ who was the former's contemporary, or it could simply be a misprint, since no other source has mentioned Hubaysh in al-Suhaylī's ancestry.

Our author was born in al-Andalus during the first decade of the sixth century hijrī (508/1114). Although those who produce al-Suhaylī's biography specified his city of permanent residence as Malaga, they all agreed that the lineage "Suhaylī" was a reference to his being a native of Suhayl. It is likely that he was born in that village and the lineage became associated with his name when he moved to Malaga where he received education and was likely to have spent most of his long life. Nothing is known of his early youth except that he lost his sight at the age of seventeen.⁵

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī was educated by a number of illustrious Andalusian scholars at the time. Malaga in which he lived

-
1. Al-Muṭrib, p.230. cf. Wafayāt, vol.1, p.351.
 2. Abū al-Khaṭṭāb ^c Umar. One of the leading scholars in ḥadīth in al-Andalus (d.633/1239). Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1420.
 3. Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssirīn, vol.1, p.266.
 4. He was one of the leading scholars in ḥadīth and fiqh in Seville (504/1110 - 584/1190). Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1353.
 5. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1349.

was described as one of the centres of scholarship. Our author showed great interest in studying recitations of the Qur'ān, fiqh (i.e. jurisprudence), and grammar. In Malaga he learned grammar as well as literature under the famous grammarian Abū al-Husayn Sulaymān ibn al-Ṭarāwa,¹ whose influence on our author's views on grammar can hardly be over estimated.² Abū Mansūr ibn al-Khayr taught our author recitations beside other scholars mentioned by al-Dhahabī and other biographers.³ In Cordova, al-Suhaylī attended the circles of Abū Dā'ūd Sulaymān ibn Yahyā⁴ who taught him recitation, though it seems likely that he sojourned there only for a short time and then left to Seville.⁵ There he met Abū Bakr ibn al-^cArabī,⁶ his most eminent teacher. Our author always referred to him as shaykhunā, i.e. our teacher. From him al-Suhaylī learned jurisprudence and most probably other subjects including theology, ~~since~~ Ibn al-^cArabī was described as an erudite scholar who was versed in all the sciences of his time, and the first to introduce the sciences of the east in Andalusia. Moreover Ibn al-^cArabī himself was a pupil of al-Ghazālī.⁷ In Seville also, al-Suhaylī further studied recitations under Shurayḥ ibn

-
1. An Andalusian scholar, who was versed in grammar and literature. Therefore he was surnamed as al-Ustadh, i.e. "The teacher". He was also known as a poet (d.528/1134). Bughya, vol.1, p.602; vol.2, p.341; Takmila, vol.2, p.705.
 2. Amālī, p.72. cf. al-Muṭrib, p.231.
 3. Such as Abū ^cAbd Allāh ibn Makkī and ^cAbd Allāh ibn Ma ^cmār, Tadhkira, vol.4, pp.1328-49. cf. al-Muṭrib, pp.230-33.
 4. He was a teacher of recitations in Cordova (d.540/1146). Takmila, vol.2, p.705.
 5. Al-Muṭrib, pp.231-233.
 6. (468/1074 - 543/1149). Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1294.
 7. Ibid.; Tālibī, vol., pp.52-6; Awāṣim, pp.6, 7, 10, 78, 79.

Muḥammad¹ and grammar under Abū al-Qāsim ^CAbd al-Rahmān al-Rammāk² who was also a pupil of ibn al-Tarāwa. Our author also seems to have come in contact with Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Tāhir.³

Probably al-Suhaylī left Seville on the departure of his teacher Ibn al-^CArabī to Marrakish in the year 542.⁴ By then he was thirty four years of age and it was likely that he had finished his studies by that age and settled in Malaga as a teacher. He seems to have had a very extensive circle. This is evident from biographies of Andalusian learned men, who succeeded our author as his name was frequently mentioned as one of the teachers.⁵

Among his pupils were: Abū Muḥammad ^CAbd Allāh ibn al-Qurtubī,⁶ Abū al-Khaṭṭāb ^CUmar ibn Dihya,⁷ Abū Muḥammad ibn

-
1. He was a khaṭīb and teacher of recitations in Seville (d.539/1145). al-^CIbar, vol.4, p.107.
 2. One of the leading Andalusian scholars in literature and grammar (d.541/1147). Takmila, vol.2, p.562.
 3. He was a leading grammarian. He wrote a commentary on the book of Sībawayh (d.580). Takmila, vol.1, p.249.
 4. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1294.
 5. See for instance Takmila et passim, al-Iḥāṭa, vol.2, p.328.
 6. He was a leading scholar in ḥadīth and recitations in Malaga (d.610/1216). Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1396.
 7. Al-Suhaylī dictated his book Al-Ta^Crīf to him. cf. above; Ta^Crīf, MS.f.2; Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1420; al-Muṭrib, p.237.

Ḥawṭ Allāh¹ and ^CUmar ibn ^CAbd al-Majīd al-Rundī.²

The biographers described al-Suhaylī as knowledgeable in linguistics, etymology and grammar. His knowledge in the latter topic was described as so extensive that he debated with Ibn Ṭarāwa on the book of Sibawayh.³ It was also reported that he was well acquainted with the science of ḥadīth and fiqh. His knowledge on these different subjects is revealed in his Rawḍ.

Besides the biographers' opinion about al-Suhaylī's accomplishments it could also be inferred from his Rawḍ that he was well acquainted with theology. In fact the influence of the Ash^Carite doctrine on him can hardly be overestimated.* This influence could be attributed to two factors. First it has already been mentioned that al-Suhaylī was a pupil of Abū Bakr ibn al-^CArabī, who was taught by al-Ghazālī and introduced his books to al-Andalus,⁵ and he was described as an Ash^Carite theologian in his general attitude with special interest in ^{al-Ghazālī's} methodology.⁶ Moreover, Ibn Taymiyya considered him one of the intimate friends of al-Ghazālī.⁷ Second, the

-
1. He was described as knowledgeable in ḥadīth and language, was appointed by al-Manṣūr of Marrakish to teach his sons (d.612/1218). Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1397.
 2. (d.616). He was requested by the people of Malaga to take al-Suhaylī's place on his departure. Takmila, vol.2, p.658.
 3. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.351. cf. al-Ṣafadī, p.187.
 4. This aspect forms the subject of Chapter V below.
 5. Ibn Khayr, vol.1, p.446; al-Ṣila, vol.2, p.532. cf. Ṭālibī, vol.1, p.55.
 6. Ṭālibī, vol.1, pp.8, 24.
 7. Naqd al-Manṭiq, pp.56, 135. cf. al-Radd ^Cala al-Manṭiqiyīn, p.482.

emphasis laid by Ibn Tumart - the founder of the Almohads dynasty - on the teaching of theology. He in his turn was reported to have been an eminent pupil of al-Ghazālī.¹ His original teaching must have reflected in the structure of the Almohads dynasty to the extent that some scholars described it as an Ash^Carite state.² It is no wonder that al-Suhaylī, having lived within this environment, was influenced by it.

He also appeared to have had a very good memory. As he wrote his book al-Rawḍ at the age of sixty-one, nevertheless he made many references to what he had written down - in his own handwriting - on the authority of his teacher Abū Bakr ibn al-^CArabī, which is probably alluding to a period prior to his blindness. What is beyond all doubt is that such material belongs to a time prior to Ibn al-^CArabī's death (543/1149)³ twenty-six years before al-Suhaylī engaged in writing his book al-Rawḍ. As he stated the date of its composition as al-Muharram; the first month of the year 569 and he finished it in the fifth month, i.e. Jumādā al-Ūlā from the same year.*

It is worth noting that al-Suhaylī was also a poet. The most famous of all his poetry in his ode called al-Qaṣīda al-^CAyniyya.⁵ It was a kind of prayer which, he claimed, would bring an immediate answer. Although one cannot expect a man of al-Suhaylī's talent and scholarship to live in poverty, this

-
1. See below p.15
 2. Al-Rawḍ, vol.1, p.17. cf. Muslim Theology, p.207; al-Muntaẓim, vol.9, p.93.
 3. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1297.
 4. Text, vol.1, p.36.
 5. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.351; al-Bidāya, vol.12, p.318. Shadharāt, vol.4, p.271; al-Dibāj, p.150; Text, vol.1, p.26. Kashf, vol.2, p.1341.

ode confirms what some biographers reported concerning his hardship.¹ However it could have been a passing phase in his life as what is beyond doubt is that al-Suhaylī became famous during his lifetime and he was summoned to the court of the then reigning caliph, Abū Ya^cqūb ibn ^cAbd al-Mu'min in Marrakish,² where he was likely to have come into contact with statesmen, scholars, philosophers and jurists. Later on al-Suhaylī was appointed chief justice³ in Marrakish and Abū Ya^cqūb conferred his favours on him. So far as is known, al-Suhaylī served no other caliph in that capacity.

Al-Suhaylī was likely to have been summoned to Marrakish in the year 578, as biographers agreed that he remained there for three years⁴ before his death. He died in Marrakish at midday on Thursday, the twenty-sixth of Sha^cbān, in the year 581/1189 at the age of seventy-three.⁵ However, al-Dā'ūdī mentioned a different account for his death as: at night on Thursday, the fifteenth of Shawwāl in the same year.⁶ The first account seems the most likely, as it was recorded by Ibn Dihya and other biographers who preceded al-Dā'ūdī (d.940/1546).

His works

Besides his book al-Rawd, which is primarily based on the sīra of Ibn Ishāq as transmitted by Ibn Hishām, al-Suhaylī wrote another commentary; Al-Ta^crīf wa al-l^clām bi mā Ubhima

-
1. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.351, al-Bidāya, vol.12, p.318, Shadharāt, vol.4, p.271.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1348. cf. al-Ṣafadī, p.187.
 4. Ibid., cf. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.351.
 5. Al-Muṭrib, p.233, al-Dibāj, p.150, al-Bidāya, vol.12, p.318.
 6. Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssirīn, vol.2, p.257.

fī al-Qur'ān min al-Asmā' al-A^Clām.¹ It was written before al-Rawḍ which can be seen clearly by the many references to the latter in the former.² The two books are of the same style; the first being an explanation of unusual expressions or obscure incidents in the sīra. The second book "Al-Ta^C rīf", "Acquainting" relates to unknown people and places referred to in the Qur'ān but not named. As has been mentioned this thesis is particularly concerned with the first book, al-Rawḍ, which is probably the last compilation of al-Suhaylī. Another major work of al-Suhaylī is Natā'ij al-Fikr. This work deals with grammar.³ On the same subject, al-Suhaylī wrote also Sharḥ al-Jumal, which was termed "incomplete" by al-Ṣafadī.⁴ In another book our author treated the question of inheritance (farā'id). He referred to it in his Rawḍ twice - once as Sharḥ Ayāt al-Waṣiyya,⁵ while on another occasion he alluded to it as Kitāb al-Farā'id wa Sharḥ Ayāt al-Waṣiyya.⁶ Similarly he referred to his book Natā'ij al-Fikr twice, quoting it as Natā'ij al-Fikr and not Natā'ij al-Naẓar as was recorded by Ibn al-^CImād.⁷ Al-Suhaylī's book of farā'id proved to have been in circulation as an independent work during the eighth century hijri (fourteenth century A.D.). This could be inferred from al-Dhahabī's text who made an allusion to what he had found written on the cover of this book.⁸ Our author also alluded to a supplement

-
1. This work was published in Cairo (1356/1938) edited by Maḥmūd Rabī^C.
 2. Text, vol.1, pp.44, 349; vol.3, p.235; vol.6, p.487.
 3. This book has been edited by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Bannā, published in 1398/1978, Beirut, bearing the same title, i.e. Natā'ij al-Fikr fī al-Naḥw.
 4. Al-Ṣafadī, p.187. cf. al-Dibāj, p.150.
 5. Text, vol.4, p.259.
 6. Ibid., p.393.
 7. Shadharāt, vol.4, p.271. cf. Text, vol.5, p.465; vol.6, p.156.
 8. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1348.

which he had written to the book entitled al-Isti^cāb of Abū^c Umar Yūsuf ibn ^cAbd al-Barr.¹ However no reference was found to this supplement in other books.

In addition to these works, al-Suhaylī wrote a considerable number of smaller treatises. Many of these are included in the Amālī, which is a collection of such treatises. The title of which is Amālī al-Suhaylī fi al-Nahw wa al-lughā wa al-Ḥadīth wa al-Fiqh.² Al-Suhaylī also referred to many of these treatises, throughout his commentary on sīra. The titles of which will be mentioned here, since acquaintance with their subjects will give the reader some idea of other subjects tackled by al-Suhaylī, and help towards the assessment that al-Rawḍ was his main work on the subject.

The first of these treatises is mentioned in connection with the difference between the meaning of nūr and diyā', both translated "light". Al-Suhaylī stated that he dictated a treatise on the meaning of Nūr al-Samāwāt wa-al-Arḍ,³ i.e. light of heaven and earth, a verse from the Qur'ān that referred to God (XXIV-35). In an account of the forms of revelation the author explained there were seven forms. He then said: I dictated a treatise on the reality of seeing God in vision and how the Prophet saw him.⁴ Apparently this treatise was an explanation of the ḥadīth in which the Prophet stated that he saw God in a dream, famous as "ḥadīth al-manām". This is evident from the vocabulary that al-Suhaylī had used.⁵ Although the third treatise that the author mentioned dealt with a verse from the Qur'ān the question was discussed from a

1. Text, vol.4, p.408.

2. Collected and edited by Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Bannā, published in Cairo 1970/1390.

3. Text, vol.2, p.256.

4. Ibid., vol.2, p.396.

5. Ibid. cf. al-Tirmidhī, vol.5, pp.44-47.

purely grammatical view. Al-Suhaylī stated that al-Zajjāj explained the inflection wrongly in a verse from Sūrat al-Kahf: "Then we roused them in order to test which of the two parties was best at calculating the term of years they had tarried" (XVIII-12).¹ After quoting the verse he summed up his arguments against al-Zajjāj and referred the reader to his treatise for further explanation.² On the same theme he stated that he dictated a chapter on another grammar question. He then summarised the substance of the chapter. The fourth mentioning of these treatises was also in connection with the Qur'ān. In an account concerning the difference of opinion between the Qur'ān commentators on the significance of the number of guardians of the fire which was revealed in the Qur'ān as nineteen and why particularly this number was specified. Al-Suhaylī referred to his treatise on this question besides the significance of the number of doors of heaven and hell.³ In the same connection al-Suhaylī referred several times to a treatise which he dictated on the meaning of eye and hand as attributed to God. He also gave a brief summary of its content.⁴ In one place, however, his words indicated that he dealt independently with each of them, i.e. eye and hand, in an independent treatise.⁵ After discussing a grammar question he alluded to another treatise he wrote on that specific subject which was Af^cāl al-Tafqīl.⁶ Another one was on the meaning of Subhān Allāh wa bi Ḥamdihi.⁷ On this occasion also he mentioned his treatise on the vision of God, "in a dream" but this time he added: and on the day of resurrection. this latter question discussed was probably

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.164.
 2. Ibid., p.170. cf. al-Zajjāj, vol.1, p.315.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.195.
 4. Ibid., p.258, cf. vol.4, p.53; vol.5, p.36.
 5. Ibid., vol.6, p.556.
 6. Ibid., vol.3, p.438, cf. p.385.
 7. Ibid., p.449, cf. vol.4, p.386; vol.6, p.421.

theological.¹ A further treatise or commentary also, was an explanation of the tradition concerning the prohibition of approaching women from the anus. He stated that he quoted proofs from the Qur'ān and Hadīth.² On grammar he dictated a treatise on Asrār ma Yanṣarif wa mā Lā Yanṣarif.³ With regard to the tradition; Allāh Jamīlun Yuḥibbu al-Jamāl, al-Suhaylī stated that he dictated a treatise on the meaning of the word maḥabba as it occurred in the aforementioned tradition, with the intention of completing what Abū al-Ma^cālī had said in its explanation in his chapter al-Ṭrāda from his book al-Shāmil.⁴ Our author also devoted a treatise to the explanation of traditions concerning the anti-Christ Al-A^cwar al-Dajjāl.⁵ Another tradition al-Suhaylī explained in a treatise was Ḥadīth al-Shu'm, i.e. ill luck, a tradition narrated in al-Muwaṭṭa' and other books.⁶ Another treatise seemed to be on theology. It was an explanation of a tradition narrated on the authority of the Prophet that he asked a slave girl where God is, when she answered: In Heaven, he said she was a believer.⁷ A final treatise was also an explanation of a tradition.⁸ However, al-Suhaylī also promised to dictate a treatise on al-Ḥurūf al-Wāqī^ca fi Awwal al-Suwar wa Asrārihā,⁹ i.e. a discussion of the abbreviated letters prefixed to certain Sūras.

1. Ibid., vol.3, p.449.

2. Ibid., p.462.

3. Ibid., vol.4, p.157. cf. vol.5, p.73; vol.6, pp.39, 200, 427, vol.7, p.36. cf. Amālī, pp.19-39.

4. Ibid., vol.4, p.282. al-Shāmil was published in Cairo 1969.

5. Text, vol.5, p.35.

6. Ibid., p.122. cf. al-Muwaṭṭa', book 54.

7. Text, vol.6, p.332. cf. al-Ibāna, pp.36-37.

8. Text, vol.7, p.531.

9. Ibid., vol.4, p.422.

Many scholars have benefited from his works, particularly Ibn Kathīr in his book al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya, al-Qaṣṣālānī in his book al-Mawāhib, al-Halabī in his biography and Ibn Hajar in his book al-Fath. The material preserved by the aforementioned writers was mainly from al-Rawḍ. Whereas Ibn al-Qayyim was obviously influenced by al-Suhaylī in most of his compilations, particularly in his book entitled Badā'i^c al-Fawā'id¹ where he preserved numerous fragments from the works of al-Suhaylī pertaining to language and grammar,² while in his book Zād al-Ma^cād, he tackled almost all the points of fiqh tackled by al-Suhaylī in his Rawḍ.³ It is worth noting that when al-Suhaylī discusses in al-Rawḍ the same points on grammar and language quoted on his authority by Ibn al-Qayyim, he seems to be brief and concise whereas the material quoted by Ibn al-Qayyim was more detailed. This gives the impression that Ibn al-Qayyim was quoting from an earlier work. Although al-Rawḍ is a commentary on the sīra, it is also regarded as the main source for al-Suhaylī's views on language and grammar. It is because of such fondness of grammar that an illustrious Andalusian grammarian, Ibn Maḍā' (513-592), accused al-Suhaylī of spending too much time on a personal interest.⁴

-
1. See for instance, Text, vol.1, pp.16-18, 22-30, 37-43, vol.2, pp.2-8, 16-17, 58-59, 72-79, 102-108.
 2. Al-Suhaylī al-Naḥwī, i.e. as a grammarian, has been dealt with in an independent thesis by al-Bannā Muhammad Ibrāhīm, College of Arabic, Azhar University, Cairo, 1971. Bibliography of Arabic Linguistics, p.184, 1975.
 3. This aspect is treated in Chapter IV below.
 4. Cf. al-Radd^c ala al-Nuḥāt, p.133.

The Political Situation

Al-Suhaylī was born during the reign of ^CAlī ibn Yūsuf ibn Tashufīn, the Almoravid Amīr and second sovereign of the Tashufīd dynasty, who ruled (from 500/1106 - 539/1145) over a large part of the Maghrib and of Southern Spain including Malaga where al-Suhaylī lived.¹ Although al-Suhaylī lived twenty-nine years or so during the Almoravid dynasty, nevertheless it is the Almohad's culture that is reflected in his commentary. This is a dynasty which is generally traced back to 515/1121 at which date Muhammad ibn ^CAbd Allāh ibn Tumart proclaimed himself the Mahdī and all the branches of the great Berber tribe of the Maṣmūda became loyal to him.² As a result of this religious movement, the Almohads gradually took over the Maghrib, destroying the Almoravids there and making Marrakish their capital. This happened during the reign of ^CAbd al-Mu'min ibn ^CAlī, the successor of Ibn Tumart, who later after the death of the former (in 524/1130) styled himself the Amīr al-Mu'minīn, i.e. the leader of the faithful.³

In al-Andalus there was a vacuum of power after the decline of the Almoravids. then ^CAbd al-Mu'min despatched an army to it and peacefully occupied all the Muslim territory there in 542/1147. Malaga in which al-Suhaylī lived was part of this.* On the death of ^CAbd al-Mu'min in 558/1163, his son Abū Ya^Cqūb Yūsuf came to power. he reigned over the Maghrib

1. Al-Mu^Cjib, p.202.

2. Ibid., p.188. cf. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.39.

3. ^CAbd al-Mu'min was a Berber from the region of Tlemcen. Both he and Ibn Tumart traced their ancestors to the Prophet. In the year 540/1145 he decided to meet the Almoravid army in open country, gaining a complete victory. (d.558/1163). al-Mu^Cjib, p.203, Wafayāt, vol.2, p.371; Ibn Khaldūn, vol.6, p.189.

4. Al-Mu^Cjib, p.213; Ibn Khaldūn, vol.6, p.189.

and Muslim Spain from 558 till his death in 580.¹ One year later al-Suhaylī died as has been mentioned.

The Intellectual Life

It was previously mentioned that the Almohads came to power as a result of a religious uprising by Ibn Tumart who is considered the founder of the Almohad dynasty, nevertheless the first caliph was ^cAbd al-Mu'min ibn ^cAlī.

In order to comprehend the flourishing of Islamic philosophy and sciences at that time and the influence of this on al-Suhaylī's work, the religious conditions of the Maghrib and Islamic Spain prior to and after the historical movement of Ibn Tumart must be taken into consideration, particularly the teaching of Ibn Tumart which underlined the Almohad thinking.

During the reign of the Almoravids, the intellectual interests in general were very narrow. Poetry, history and other subjects were pursued, but little of original value was produced. The science of uṣūl al-dīn, i.e. kalām or theology had been completely censored, and naturally this applied to philosophy.²

As for fiqh, the doctrines of the school of Mālik were

-
1. He was described as a man with great ambitions and insatiable love of knowledge, particularly science. He also took a great interest in arts, and persuaded by his ambitions, studied philosophy and medicine. He kept an extensive collection of books so that his library had grown larger than any of the previous rulers of the Maghrib. al-Mu^cjib, p.233. cf. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.374.
 2. Al-Mu^cjib, p.173, EI^I, "Almoravids"; "Almohades".

adopted.¹ The Almoravid rulers showed themselves to be protectors and guardians of these doctrines and encouraged the jurists in this way by granting favours only to those who applied themselves exclusively to the study of the Mālikite treatises of the furū^C, i.e. the actual practices of Islamic Law.² Little attention was paid to the fundamental sources. Indeed the triumph of the Mālikite doctrines caused the Qur'ān and ḥadīth to be only referred to via these doctrines.³ However, Ibn Ḥazm (d.456), a theologian of Muslim Spain who developed the Zāhirite School of Law into a school of theology, revolted against this but had apparently accomplished little.⁴

In the first decade of the sixth century hijrī an ex-Zāhirite adherent, a Berber from Sūs, Ibn Tumart, returned to the Maghrib from the east where he had studied the Ash^Carite theology as modified by al-Ghazālī of whom the former was an eminent pupil. Moreover he familiarized himself with the theological principles of al-Ash^Carī himself.⁵ It seems likely that there was an intimate connection between al-Ghazālī and Ibn Tumart. MacDonald has said of this, "If only in view of the syncretism practised by both, it was fitting that al-Ghazālī and Ibn Tumart should be brought closely together. Yet it is hard to explain the persistence with which the great Ash^Carite is made the teacher and guide of the Semi Zāhirite".⁶

I think it is of value to mention here this story which might reveal the obscurity to which MacDonald alluded.⁷ It was

1. Al-Mu^Cjib, p.173, EI¹, "Almoravids"; "Almohades".

2. Ibid.

3. Al-Mu^Cjib, p.173.

4. Muslim Theology, p.245.

5. Al-Mu^Cjib, p.188, Wafayāt, vol.2, p.39, EI¹, "Ibn Tumart".

6. Muslim Theology, p.249.

7. Ibid.

said that the Amīr of the Almoravids went so far as to order the burning in public of the masterpiece of al-Ghazālī because the jurists there considered it to be heterodox.¹ This was brought to the notice of al-Ghazālī in the presence of Ibn Tumart and others. Thereupon al-Ghazālī stated: "Shortly his sovereignty would be abolished, his sons would be killed and I do not think the man in command would be other than one of those who are present in this meeting".² Al-Marrakishī commented on this saying: At that time Ibn Tumart was thinking of rebelling against the Almoravids, but having heard this from al-Ghazālī, it further encouraged him.³ It can perhaps be understood from this story that al-Ghazālī exercised some influence on the thinking of Ibn Tumart, as he was a vigorous opponent of the Almoravid regime and it seems likely that he provided an intellectual base to Ibn Tumart for his movement.

Although Ibn Tumart started his movement as a mere reformer, later he insisted strongly on the idea of the Mahdī, he even strived by miracle-working to add to his followers and achieve his objects.⁴ The doctrine which he preached bears evident marks of the influence of the Ash^carism as modified by al-Ghazālī and Zāhirite thinking as developed by Ibn Hazm.⁵ Ibn Tumart's concern for theology must have reflected in the structure of the Almohad state; this is evident from al-Suhaylī's work as he discusses theology freely.⁶

^cAbd al-Mu'min, the first caliph, paid great attention to

-
1. Al-Mu^cjib, p.172, al-I^cbar, vol.4, p.102.
 2. Al-Mu^cjib, p.178.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.38. cf. al-Mu^cjib, p.188. EI^I, "Ibn Tumart".
 5. Muslim Theology, p.246.
 6. This aspect of al-Suhaylī is treated below in Chapter V.

scholars but being involved in many wars, the flourishing of science and philosophy came to its peak at the time of his son Abū Ya^cqūb Yūsuf, a great scholar himself. He summoned scholars to his court which became a centre of scholarship and all sciences were invigorated.¹ Surrounded by famous philosophers, physicians and poets, Abū Ya^cqūb was considered a great friend of scholarship. With the Almohad dynasty under his reign, the Maghrib saw its most brilliant period and it was described as the golden age of the Islamic civilization in the Maghrib. It suffices to recall that two of the great Arab philosophers, Abū Bakr ibn al-Tufayl (d.581/1187)² and Ibn Rushd (Averroes), the last of the great Aristotelians (d.595/1201),³ encouraged by him produced their most celebrated works. Indeed, it was in this very same period that al-Suhaylī was summoned to Marrakish and appointed chief justice.

-
1. Al-Mu^cjib, p.238.
 2. He is the author of the philosophical novel Ḥayy ibn Yaqzān. He acted as a medical attendant and wazir to Abū Ya^cqūb. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.314; EI,² "Ibn Tufayl".
 3. He is renowned for his commentary on Aristotle. He acted as judge in different places in Spain and was court physician to Abū Ya^cqūb for some time. Takmila, vol.1, p.269; EI,² "Ibn Rushd".

CHAPTER II

THE WRITING OF SĪRA UP TO THE TIME OF AL-SUHAYLĪ

It has been previously mentioned that al-Suhaylī's commentary (Al-Rawḍ al-Unuf) rests on Ibn Hishām's biography of the Prophet which was originally written by Ibn Ishāq. Since al-Suhaylī himself stated in his introduction that he extracted his book from more than one hundred and twenty books, it is necessary to review the writing of sīra up to his time. However, some of the books he used were not confined to the sīra.

The importance of the Prophet's biography was realized as early as his lifetime. His Companions were greatly concerned about his sayings and deeds. ^cAbd Allāh ibn ^cAbbās (4 B.H./ 68 A.H.) was said to have devoted evenings to the teaching of maghāzī.¹ Although nowhere in the older sources² is it said that Ibn ^cAbbās composed an actual book on the maghāzī.³ Another Companion who was considerably older than Ibn ^cAbbās was ^cAbd Allāh ibn ^cAmr ibn al-^cĀṣ (27 B.H. - 63 A.H.), who is said to have collected a number of reports on the Prophet's

-
1. Ṭabaqāt, vol.2, p.368; cf. p.371. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.235. The use of the word maghāzī was not confined to the Prophet's campaigns but it was used to refer to his biography in general. See Bidāya, vol.3, p.243. cf. Maghāzī, vol.1, p.19; Zakkar, p.32.
 2. Kashf.
 3. In one place, however, Mūsā ibn ^cUqba expressly mentions such records of Ibn ^cAbbās as made use of by him: "Kūrayb (98/719), mawla of Ibn ^cAbbās, left with us a camel load of the writings of Ibn ^cAbbās." Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.293.

campaigns and his traditions in the well-known al-Ṣaḥīfa al-Ṣādiqa.¹ From al-Bukhārī's collection of traditions it is very evident that al-Barā' ibn ^ʿĀzib (d.74/695) had transmitted a great number of traditions concerning the Prophet's biography via the illustrious Kufan historian Abū Ishāq al-Sabī^ʿī² (29-127). Abān³ (20-100) the son of the third caliph ^ʿUthmān is the first to be known of those who had written a book on ṣīra.⁴ Frequently his name occurs in the isnād of ḥadīth, while unfortunately it is altogether absent from the works on Ṣīra. It was reported that Sulaymān ibn ^ʿAbd al-Malik caused his book on Ṣīra to be destroyed, because he regarded it as exaggerating the merits of the Anṣār whilst not mentioning any merits for the Umayyads. The incident took place in the year 82 A.H.⁵

^ʿUrwa ibn al-Zubayr (26-94)⁶ as an authority on the maghāzī is considered of much greater importance than Abān. Unlike those of Abān, a very large number of his writings have come down to us. This makes him the earliest extant authority in the field of ṣīra. However, he is even considered the founder of Islamic history. His writing is based mainly on

-
1. Ṭabaqāt, vol.2, p.373.
 2. Maghāzī ^ʿUrwa, pp.25-27.
 3. He was one of the fuqahā' of Medina where he acted as a governor for seven years up to the year 83 A.H. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.152; Ta'rīkh, vol.4, p.420; Tahdhīb, vol.1, p.99.
 4. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.210.
 5. Al-Muwāfaqiyyāt, pp.222-223. cf. Maghāzī ^ʿUrwa, p.28.
 6. It is from him that ^ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Marwān sought instructions in the maghāzī. Ṭabaqāt, vol.4, p.178 seq.; Ta'rīkh, vol.2, pp.328, 366, 375, 421; vol.3, p.55. Tahdhīb, vol.7, p.184

his own collection of the traditions.¹

The third Medinan authority on maghāzī was Shurahbīl ibn Sa^cd (123 A.H.),² who quoted some of the Companions of the Prophet as his authorities:³ namely, Zayd ibn Thābit, Abū Hurayra and Abū Sa^cīd al-Khudrī. He was said to have been well versed in the information regarding the battles of Badr and Uhud.⁴ Due to his old age he became confused, consequently people dropped his maghāzī.⁵ Although Ibn Sa^cd classified him as unreliable⁶ he quoted him in connection with a report concerning the emigration of the Prophet from Qubā' to Medina.⁷

Another man of the same generation was Abū ^cUmar ^cĀmir ibn Shurāhīl (17-103) known as al-Sha^cbī, a native from Hamdān.⁸ He was the eminent teacher of Abū Hanīfa. Like Abān he was described as an authority on maghāzī. It was related that: Ibn ^cUmar once attended the circle of al-Sha^cbī while he was lecturing on maghāzī. On hearing him Ibn ^cUmar exclaimed "By God I was present with those people during these events but this man is more knowledgeable than I".⁹ But al-Sha^cbī never wrote a book on maghāzī, he used to boast saying: mā katabtu sawdā' fī baydā',¹⁰ referring to his excellent

-
1. His writings were extraced and published in a book 1401/1981 by al-A^czamī.
 2. A freedman of the Banū Khatma. Tabaqāt, vol.5, p.310. Tahdhīb, vol.4, p.321.
 3. Tabaqāt, vol.5, p.310, Tahdhīb, vol.4, p.321.
 4. Tahdhīb, vol.4, p.321, cf. vol.10, p.361.
 5. Tabaqāt, vol.5, p.228.
 6. Ibid., p.310.
 7. Ibid., vol.1, p.237.
 8. Ibid., vol.6, p.246. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.79.
 9. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.82.
 10. Ibid.

memory. This is very interesting as it emphasises the fact that by the time of al-Sha^c bī, the people were in the habit of committing to writing whatever information they may receive, otherwise committing to memory cannot be a subject of boasting.

An important writer belonging to the same time was Wahb ibn Munabbih (d. 114 A.H.).¹ He handed down traditions on the authority of Ibn ^cAbbās, Jābir, Abū Hurayra and others.² As a transmitter he is considered trustworthy, but he takes special interest in the traditions of Jewish and Christian sources. It was he who supported this ~~fact~~ by his statement that he had read more than seventy-two of their holy scriptures.³ In his book Kitāb al-Muḥtadā' he made use of those sources. Al-Tabarī preserved numerous quotations on his authority related to the subject⁴ and so did Ibn Qutayba in his book al-Ma^cārif. In the older works of Sīra Wahb is nowhere quoted as an authority on the life-story of the Prophet.⁵ However a fragment of his book Kitāb al-Maghāzī has been discovered by C.H. Becker.⁶ This fragment - as was stated by Horowitz - contains nothing new, but it showed that, already in the year 100 A.H. or earlier, the biography of the Prophet was narrated exactly as in later works.⁷

One of the chief authorities of the two most illustrious writers on the Prophet's life; Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, was ^cĀsim ibn ^cUmar ibn Qatāda al-Anṣārī (d.120). He lectured in

-
1. A Yamanite of Persian origin. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.543. Cf. Ta'rīkh, vol.3, p.158.
 2. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.100.
 3. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.543.
 4. See for instance Ta'rīkh, vol.1, 2 et passim.
 5. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.100. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.180.
 6. Preserved in Papyri Schott - Reinhardt 8, Heidelberg. Islamic Culture, vol.1, 1927, p.558.
 7. Ibid.

Damascus¹ and Medina on the Prophet's campaigns and is said to have committed his lectures to writing.² His scholarship in the ṣīra and maghāzī was renowned³ and he was considered as an authentic transmitter.⁴

Among the weightiest authorities of Ibn Ishāq was Muḥammad ibn Muslim ibn ^ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d.124 A.H.) who came from a Meccan clan, the Banū Zuhra.⁵ He studied with Sa^ʿīd ibn al-Musayyab for ten years;⁶ also among his teachers was ^ʿUrwa ibn al-Zubayr.⁷ His indefatigable zeal for collecting reports was supported by a remarkable memory.⁸ At the command of Khālīd ibn ^ʿAbd Allāh al-Qasrī, al-Zuhrī wrote down the ṣīra.⁹ In his work he dealt with the whole life-story of the Prophet, not only the maghāzī.¹⁰ However this work has not come down to us but a great number of fragments of it have been borrowed in the works of the biographers of the Prophet.¹¹ It is evident from al-Rawḍ al-Unuf of al-Suhaylī that al-Zuhrī's Ṣīra was accessible during the sixth century as al-Suhaylī quoted it by

-
1. He was appointed by ^ʿUmar ibn ^ʿAbd al-^ʿAziz to teach the Prophet's campaigns in the mosque of Damascus - Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.349.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid. cf. Ma^ʿārif, p.236, Tahdhīb, vol.5, p.53.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Tadhkira, vol.1, pp.108-112. Wafayāt, vol.1, p.571.
 6. Ṭabaqāt, vol.2, p.383.
 7. Ibid., p.382. ^ʿUrwa was considered the chief authority of al-Zuhrī. Ṭabaqāt, vol.4, p.178 seq. cf. Maghāzī ^ʿUrwa, p.77. Zakkar, p.24.
 8. Ṭabaqāt, vol.2, pp.388-389. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.110.
 9. Hājī Khalīfa mentioned it, Kashf, vol.2, p.1747.
 10. Ṭabaqāt, vol.2, p.388.
 11. The work of al-Zuhri as taken from other sources is being prepared by al-A^ʿzamī. Maghāzī ^ʿUrwa, p.29.

name several times.¹ Part of it was published by Zakkar in 1980.

A man who deserves special mention because he devoted his attention to the life of the Prophet and his maghāzī, is ^ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abi Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ^ʿAmr ibn Hazm (d.130 A.H.). He was also one of the chief authorities of Ibn Ishāq. Al-Zuhri said of him that he had no equal in all Medina.² From the quotations in the works of Ibn Ishāq, al-Wāqidī, Ibn Saʿd and Tabarī - as observed by Horovitz - we can picture the activity of ^ʿAbd Allāh as a transmitter of tradition concerning maghāzī, the youth and early years of the Prophet, and the embassies of the Arabian tribes to the Prophet. He has also transmitted reports concerning particular events after the Prophet's death but his name appears most often in connection with the maghāzī.³ He is considered to be the earliest who sought to establish the chronological order of events. Ibn Ishāq borrowed from him a list of the Prophet's campaigns in chronological order.⁴

A man of the same generation is Abū al-Aswad Muḥammad ibn ^ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Nawfal, known as Yatīm ^ʿUrwa (d. after 131 A.H.). His grandfather Nawfal ibn Khuwaylid al-Qurashī was one of those early Muslims who emigrated to Abyssinia.⁵ It was recorded that Abū al-Aswad left a book on the Prophet's campaigns.⁶ However it was proved that the book ascribed to him was only a version of the maghāzī of ^ʿUrwa ibn al-Zubayr.⁷ As a transmitter he was considered trustworthy.⁸

1. See for instance Text, vol.2, pp.123, 220, 240.

2. Tahdhīb, vol.5, p.165.

3. Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, pp.26-7.

4. Ibid., Ta'rikh, vol.3, pp.152, 154.

5. Ṭabaqāt, vol.4, p.120. Maghāzī ^ʿUrwa, p.59.

6. Ibid.

7. Maghāzī ^ʿUrwa, p.59.

8. Ibid.

Another man of the same generation as al-Zuhrī was Sulaymān ibn al-Mu^c tamir al-Taymī¹ (d.143/764). He was described as trustworthy.² He also compiled a book on the sīra of the Prophet.³ Al-Suhaylī quoted his work several times, always comparing the material with that of Mūsa ibn ^cUqba even so his sīra seemed to have included more details than that of the latter⁴ or sometimes even different accounts.⁵

Three of al-Zuhrī's students are known to us as authors of books on the Prophet's biography: Mūsa ibn ^cUqba, Ma^cmar ibn Rāshid and Muḥammad ibn Ishāq. Mūsa ibn ^cUqba ibn Abi ^cAyyāsh (55-141), was a mawlā of the family of al-Zubayr ibn al-^cAwwām.⁶ He was ranked as a special expert in the maghāzī. Mālik ibn Anas, the famous jurist, praised him, saying: "You must hold to the maghāzī of Mūsa ibn ^cUqba, for he is trustworthy".⁷ Al-Zuhrī was his weightiest authority.⁸ There are numerous quotations from his work⁹ in the Tabaqāt of Ibn Sa^cd and some are preserved by al-Tabarī. Probably he made use of the written records of older authorities, as he mentioned the writing of Ibn ^cAbbās that had been left with him.¹⁰

-
1. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.150.
 2. Ibid., pp.151, 152.
 3. Ibn Khayr, vol.1, p.231. cf. vol.2, p.496.
 4. Text, vol.2, p.299; cf. vol.3, p.161; vol.4, pp.46, 56.
 5. Ibid., vol.5, p.173.
 6. Tahdhīb, vol.10, p.360, Tadhkira, vol.1, p.148.
 7. Tahdhīb, vol.10, p.361.
 8. Ibid.
 9. Goldziher shows that Mūsa's work was in circulation as late as the end of the 9th century, hijrī. Life of Muḥammad, XVI. A fragment of his work has survived and was published by Sachau in 1904. Cf. Ibid., xliii-xlvii.
 10. See above p.18. n.3

Ma^Cmar ibn Rāshid (96 - 154 A.H.)¹ was a mawla, i.e. freedman, of the Banū Haddān. Although he was born at Basra he settled in San^Cā',² the capital of Yaman. Ibn al-Nadīm in his Fihrist,³ names him as an author of a Kitāb al-maghāzī,⁴ of which however only fragments have come down to us, especially in the works of al-Wāqidī and Ibn Sa^Cd. There are also some in Balādhurī and Tabarī. Most of his statements go back to al-Zuhrī. Besides the maghāzī, he paid attention also to the biblical history of former revelations - Tabarī has preserved much of this part.

Despite all these works on sīra which seem to have started from the very earliest times of Islam, the fame of the work of Ibn Ishāq has outshone the fame of all other works in this field because it is the first which has come down to us.

Muhammad ibn Ishāq (85 - 151)⁵ also came from a family of mawālī. His grandfather was a freedman from the Medinan family of Qays ibn Makhrama ibn al-Muttalib ibn ^CAbd Manāf.⁶ Ibn Ishāq was described as a zealous collector of traditions.⁷ He used the numerous statements he collected to enlarge the material he received from his teachers.

The original work of Ibn Ishāq - which was divided into three parts of al-Mubtada', al-Mab^Cath and al-Maghāzī - is no

-
1. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.546. Ibn Sa^Cd gave a different date for his death as 153 or 151.
 2. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.190.
 3. Fihrist, p.138.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ṭabaqāt, vol.7, p.322. Tahdhīb, vol.9, p.142, Irshād, vol.6, p.399. Wafayāt, vol.1, p.611. Ta'rīkh Baghdād, vol.1, p.215 seq.
 6. Ṭabaqāt, vol.7, p.321, Ta'rīkh Baghdād, vol.1, p.215.
 7. Irshād, vol.6, p.400.

longer extant. Probably these parts, which were always referred to as sections, were independent volumes. As in connection with the biography of Salama ibn al-Fadl, Ibn Sa^cd stated that he transmitted both al-Maghāzī and al-Mubtada' on the authority of Ibn Ishāq.¹ It is worthwhile giving a brief outline of the original work:

(i) al-Mubtada' is in four sections. The first consists of the pre-Islamic revelations. The second, the history of Yaman in pre-Islamic times. The third, Arabian tribes and their idol worship, while the fourth deals with the immediate ancestors of the Prophet.

(ii) al-Mab^cath, includes the Prophet's life in Mecca and the Hijra.

(iii) al-Maghāzī is the history of the Prophet in Medina till his death.²

The main source for Ibn Ishāq's text is the edition of Ibn Hishām who set out in his introduction the principles underlying his revision.³ Numerous fragments of the material omitted by him have been preserved in other books.⁴ Al-Ṭabarī in his History in particular has preserved a large amount of material belonging to the Mubtada'. Al-Azraqī in his History of Mecca has preserved reports dealing with the previous history of Mecca. Al-Suhaylī preserved numerous accounts, beside some of the poetry that Ibn Hisham left out because he doubted its authenticity.⁵

1. Ṭabaqāt, vol.7, p.381.

2. Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, pp.175-6.

3. Text, vol.1, p.83.

4. A list of these books is preserved by A. Guillaume, The Life of Muḥammad, xxxi seq.

5. See Arabic Appendix below.

An early critic of poetry Muhammad ibn Sāllam al-Jumāhī (d.231 A.H.)¹ makes some observations, and accused Ibn Ishāq of being one of those who did harm to poetry.² However, the authenticity of the poetry included in the sīra, seemed to be questioned during the lifetime of Ibn Ishāq, who excused himself by saying that he was not an expert in the field of poetry and that he merely passed on what was communicated to him.³ J. Horovitz excused Ibn Ishāq - referring to the poetry cited in the sīra saying: he made no inquiries as to their authenticity as the professional connoisseurs of poetry were wont to do, and the question of their authenticity did not particularly touch him.⁴

It seems fair to accuse Ibn Ishāq of a lack of critical judgement by introducing into the sīra literature, poetry and information concerning people who lived thousands of years before the time of the Prophet without having any authentic sources.⁵

Unfortunately we have no information regarding the presentation of the material in the sīra. Nevertheless Horovitz assumed that the presentation of the sīra - which he described as being well-arranged⁶ - was made by Ibn Ishāq himself. Probably A. Guillaume held the same conviction when he dealt

-
1. Ṭabaqāt Fuḥūl al-Shu^carā', the introduction, Irshād, vol.8, p.14.
 2. Ṭabaqāt Fuḥūl al-Shu^carā', pp.8, 9.
 3. Ibid., p.9.
 4. Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, p.180; cf. Ta'rīkh al-Ṭabarī. e.g. vol.1, pp.220, 221, 223, 224.
 5. A summary of Muslim opinion of Ibn Ishāq is preserved in Uyūn al-Athar by Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, vol.1, pp.10-17, translated by A. Guillaume: The Life of Muhammad, p.xxxv. cf. Mizān, vol.3, p.468.
 6. Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, p.181.

with Ibn Hishām as an editor of the ṣīra.¹ However, a comparison of the text of Ibn Ishāq according to the riwāya of Yūnus ibn Bukayr (d.199) with the text of Ibn Hishām forced him to say: "If Ibn Ishāq gave his lectures in the form and order in which Yūnus ibn Bukayr recorded them, then we owe much to Ibn Hishām for his painstaking efforts to introduce some sort of logical and chronological order in the narrative".² But the question was left open as the text of Yūnus cannot be regarded as sufficient evidence. However it can hardly be believed that Ibn Hishām who took credit for every single word which he added to the Ṣīra would omit to mention such a task as introducing an order into the text.

Ibn al-Nadīm has recorded a book of maghāzī of Abū Ma^cshar. Najīh ibn ^cAbd al-Rahmān al-Sindī (d.170/787),³ al-Wāqidī and Ibn Sa^cd have preserved some fragments of his maghāzī.⁴ He was appointed by the Caliph al-Mahdī as a teacher of fiqh in Baghdād. Among his authorities were Nāfi^c, the Mawlā of Ibn ^cUmar, Muḥammad ibn Ka^cb al-Qurazī, and other scholars of Medina.⁵ Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal described him as: baṣīr fī al-maghāzī,⁶ i.e. an expert in the field of the Prophet's campaigns. Besides the fragments that were preserved by Ibn Sa^cd and al-Wāqidī, al-Ṭabarī referred to Abū Ma^cshar concerning information on biblical history and on the Prophet's life, especially chronological statements.⁷

-
1. The Life of Muhammad, p.xli.
 2. New Light, p.8.
 3. A freedman from Yaman, possibly of Indian origin, he lived in Medina - Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.418; Irshād, vol.3, p.166, Tahdhib, vol.10, p.421.
 4. See for instance maghāzī, pp.19, 149, 152, 154, 199; Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, pp.77, 115, 123, 151, 161.
 5. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.235.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Ta'rikh, vol.1, p.340; vol.6, pp.418, 419.

A book on sīra was also ascribed to Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥārith, better known as Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī (d.185/806).¹ He transmitted material on the authority of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī^cī, Mūsa ibn ^cUqba and others.² Al-Shāfi^cī described his sīra as being without rival.³

Like Abū Ma^cshar, Abū ^cAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ^cUmar al-Wāqidī (d.207) also belongs to the group of mawālī living in Medina.⁴ The caliph al-Ma'mūn appointed him Judge of the eastern part of Baghdād.⁵ He was described as a zealous collector of traditions and an insatiable lover of knowledge.⁶ His literary activity extended over various fields. A list of his writings consisting of more than twenty-seven works, is given by Ibn al-Nadīm.⁷ On the subjects related to the sīra he wrote: Al-Ta'rīkh al-Kabīr, al-Ta'rīkh wa al-maghāzī wa al-Mab^cath, Akhbār Mecca, Azwāj al-Nabī, Wafāt al-Nabī and al-Sīra. Out of all his writings, only his book on maghāzī⁸

1. Ibn Khayr, vol.2, p.496; cf. vol.1, p.236; Tadhkira, vol.1, p.273. This work is edited by Fārūq Hamāda, Cairo, 1983/1403.

2. Tahdhīb, vol.1, pp.152, 153.

3. Ibid.

4. Irshād, vol.7, p.55 seq. He was a Mawlā of ^cAbd Allāh ibn Buraida who belonged to the Medinan family of Aslam, Tadhkira, vol.1, p.348. Dibāj, p.230.

5. Ta'rīkh, vol.3, p.1037. Ma^cārif, p.258. Irshād, vol.7, p.56.

6. Irshād, vol.7, p.58, Fihrist, p.144, Ma^cārif, p.258, Tadhkira, vol.1, p.348.

7. Fihrist, p.144, cf. Irshād, vol.7, p.56. Maghāzī, p.11. EI, "Al-Wāqidī".

8. This work was published in Berlin 1882 ed. by Wellhausen, entitled Muḥammad in Medina. A fragment of it was published in 1855 by A. Kremer. Another edition of one third was published in Cairo in 1947 by ^cAbbās al-Shirbinī. The work was edited by Marsden Jones, Cairo, 1964. The Kitāb al-Maghāzī of al-Wāqidī.

has survived as an independent work. However al-Suhaylī recorded a book entitled Intiqāl al-Nūr (Transition of Light),¹ and ascribed it to al-Wāqidī as well as a Kitāb al-Mawlid.² Probably these are two parts belonging to the section al-Mab^cath of Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh wa al-Maghāzī wa al-Mab^cath since they have not been recorded elsewhere and it is evident from their titles that both were on the subject of mab^cath.

Numerous extracts from his other works have been preserved by Ibn Sa^cd, Tabarī and Abū al-Qāsim ibn Hubaysh (d. 584 A.H.).³ Al-Wāqidī reported on the authority of al-Zuhrī, Ma^cmar ibn Rāshid, Abū Ma^cshar and Mūsa ibn ^cUqba. It is remarkable that he did not mention Ibn Ishāq among his authorities. As a result such scholars as J. Horovitz and Wellhausen went as far as to accuse al-Wāqidī of making great use of Ibn Ishāq's work.⁴ On the other hand scholars like A. Guillaume⁵ and Marsden Jones⁶ do not hold the same conviction. However we must not forget that at the time of al-Wāqidī, Ibn Ishāq was not "his most celebrated predecessor", to use Horovitz's expression.⁷ Bearing in mind that the

1. Text, vol.1, p.93.

2. Ibid., p.61.

3. An Andalusian scholar and one of al-Suhaylī's contemporaries. In his book al-Ghazawāt he preserved numerous fragments from Kitāb al-Ridda of al-Wāqidī. See Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, p.516.

4. See EI¹, "Wāqidī," J.W. Muhammad in Medina, Introduction, p.12 seq. Islamic Culture, vol.2, p.518.

5. Life of Muhammad, the introduction xxxii.

6. The introduction of The Kitāb al-Maghāzī of al-Wāqidī, ed.M.J., p.29. Marsden Jones refuted the arguments of Horovitz in Article: "Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī: the dream of ^cĀtika and the raid to Nakhla in relation to the charge of plagiarism," B.S.O.A.S., vol.XXII,1, 1959.

7. EI¹, "Wāqidī."

maghāzī of ^ʿUrwa, al-Zuhri, Mūsā ibn ^ʿUqba, Abū Ma^ʿshar and ^ʿĀṣim ibn Qatāda were still accessible.

Abū ^ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Sa^ʿd, kātib (secretary) of al-Wāqidī was born at Baṣra in 168 A.H.¹ Ibn Ma^ʿrūf (d. 300 A.H.) combined Ibn Sa^ʿd's book Akḥbār al-Nabī with Ṭabaqāt,² the first part of which was devoted to the Prophet's biography including his campaigns. He relies above all upon al-Wāqidī, Abū Ma^ʿshar and Mūsā ibn ^ʿUqba. However, Ibn al-Nadīm considered him merely a transmitter of al-Wāqidī's works. He said in connection with him that he based his books to a large extent upon the writings of al-Wāqidī.³ Nevertheless Ibn Sa^ʿd was described as having much more to say on some matters than Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī. He mentions for example letters and embassies.⁴ Moreover Horovitz considered Ibn Sa^ʿd the first to have inspired the later works on the Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa by his chapter on the Ṣifāt akhlāq Rasūl Allāh.⁵ Yet it seems that ^ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr b. ^ʿĪsa, known as Abū Bakr al-Ḥamīdī who died (219), seems to be the first to compile a book on Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa⁶ as it was recorded by Ḥājī Khalīfa.⁷ However al-Suhaylī did not refer to Ibn Sa^ʿd. Possibly our author contents himself with the works of al-Wāqidī, since Ibn Sa^ʿd makes no secret of using them as his main source, or perhaps, Ibn Sa^ʿd's work was not easy to get hold of in al-Andalus at the time.⁸

-
1. Wafayāt, vol.1, p.641; Ṭabaqāt, the introduction.
 2. Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, p.522.
 3. Fihrist, p.145. Cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, pp.10, 11.
 4. Islamic Culture, vol.2, 1928, p.523.
 5. Ibid. Cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.15.
 6. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.502.
 7. Kashf, vol.2, p.1059.
 8. His book is described as being of a limited circulation in al-Andalus. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.15.

The sīra now is well known as Sīrat Ibn Hishām, who received the text of Ibn Ishāq from al-Bakkā'ī' (d.183/799), a pupil of Ibn Ishāq. However, it should be noted that the sīra of Ibn Hishām is not the full work of Ibn Ishāq.

Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Hishām (d.218) who was born and spent his life in Egypt, was described as knowledgeable in genealogy and grammar.¹ The principles underlying his edition of the sīra are set out in his introduction.² He left out the biblical history from Ādam to Ibrāhīm, known as the Mabda' section in Ibn Ishāq's work, which probably contained information on the authority of Jews and Christians³ or perhaps it was based on Wahb ibn Munabbih's work⁴ which was entitled al-Mubtada'. Further on he left out any material not directly relevant to the biography of the Prophet.⁵ His greatest service has been described as his critical observations on the authenticity of a large section of the poetry of the sīra.⁶ He discarded such poems as were known to no expert of poetry he questioned. He also gave more accurate versions of some of the poems and introduced shawāhid (verses) to illustrate the meaning of difficult words and phrases. Occasionally he adds genealogical notes. Besides his edition of the sīra becoming the basic work on the subject, he could also be regarded as the first commentator.⁷ Hājī Khalīfa

1. Text, vol.1, p.21.

2. Ibid., p.28.

3. Islamic Culture. vol.2, 1928, p.175.

4. Ibid. Hājī Khalīfa ascribed to Wahb a Kitāb al-Isrā'iliyyāt, vol.2, p.1390.

5. Professor Montgomery Watt stated that comparison shows that what Ibn Hishām has omitted was chiefly material not directly relevant to the career of the Prophet. See El, "Ibn Hishām".

6. Life of Muḥammad, introduction p.xlii.

7. See below pp.63-7

ascribed to him a book on Sharḥ ma Waqaʿa fī Ashʿār al-Siyar min al-Gharīb which al-Suhaylī did not see though he alluded to it.¹

Among those who died in the year 286 A.H. al-Dhahabī mentioned Abū Saʿīd ʿAbd al-Rahīm ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Rahīm al-Barqī and described him as rāwī al-sīra; the transmitter of sīra.² Like Abū Saʿīd, his brother Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh (d.249) was also known as Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Barqī. According to one account they were Egyptians known by this lineage because they used to trade with Barqa of Qum.³ Abū ʿAbd Allāh was taught by the famous scholar ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Hishām, from whom he transmitted the sīra.⁴ In his turn their brother Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Barqī (d.270)⁵ transmitted the sīra too. But he transmitted part of it on the authority of his brother ʿAbd al-Rahīm.⁶ He also compiled a book on Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥāba, transmitted on his authority by Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Madāʾinī.⁷

In connection with the latter's biography, Yāqūt confuses him with another Barqī known by the name of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Barqī, who was from Barqa of Qum. To Yāqūt all these scholars were from Barqa, but the first account appears to be the most reliable.⁸ Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Barqī, mentioned by Yāqūt seems to be the Shiʿite Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Barqī who has nothing to do with the writing of sīra.⁹

1. Kashf, vol.2, p.1012. Cf. Text, vol.1, p.43.

2. Tadhkira, vol.2, p.637.

3. Ibid., p.569.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.570.

6. Ibid., vol.2, p.570. Cf. Text, vol.7, p.532.

7. Tadhkira, vol.2, p.570.

8. Ibid., p.569. cf. Irshad, vol.1, p.160.

9. See Tūsi, p.37.

From al-Suhaylī's work it is very evident that at least one of the brothers had probably written a commentary on the Ṣīra, although nowhere in the older sources¹ is it recorded.²

A zealous writer, whose compilations seem to have exceeded twenty eight works on the subject of ṣīra, though none of them has survived as an independent work, is Abū al-Hasan ^CAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn ^CAbd Allāh, known as al-Madā'inī³ (135 - 215 A.H.). He was described as trustworthy if he reported on the authority of the well known authorities.⁴ Ibn al-Nadīm provided us with a list of al-Madā'inī's works on ṣīra as: Kitāb Ummahāt al-Nabī, Kitāb Ṣifāt al-Nabī, Kitāb ^CUḥūd al-Nabī, Kitāb tasmiyat al-Ladhina yu'dhūn al-Nabī, Kitāb Rasā'il al-Nabī, Kitāb Kutub al-Nabī ila al-Mulūk, Kitāb Ayāt al-Nabī, Kitāb Iqtā^C al-Nabī, Kitāb Futūḥ al-Nabī, Kitāb Ṣulḥ al-Nabī, Kitāb Khuṭab al-Nabī, Kitāb Sarāyā Rasūl Allāh, Kitāb al-Wufūd, which consisted of information concerning the delegations of Yaman, Muḍar,⁵ and Rabī^Ca. Kitāb Du^Cā' al-Nabī, Kitāb Azwāj al-Nabī, Kitāb ^CUmmāl al-Nabī ^Calā al-Ṣadaqāt, Kitāb ma nahā ^Canhū Rasūl Allāh, Kitāb Akhbār al-Nabī, Kitāb al-Khātim wa -al Rusul, Kitāb man Katab Lahu al-Nabī Kitāb wa Amān, Kitāb Amwāl al-Nabī wa Kuttābuhu wa man Kan Yaruddu^Calayhi al-Ṣadaqa min al-^CArab,⁶ and finally Kitāb al-maghāzī. Ibn al-Nadīm commented that Abū al-Hasan b. al-Kūfī alleged that a copy of

1. Kashf.

2. See below pp. 49-50

3. A Mawlā of Sumra ibn Ḥabīb ibn ^CAbd Shams, ibn ^CAbd Manāf. Irshād, vol.5, p.309. Fihrist, p.147.

4. Irshād, vol.5, p.310.

5. According to Yāqūt "Muḍar" but he quoted from al-Fihrist where it is Miṣr. See vol.5, p.312. It seems probable that the first is correct.

6. In the Fihrist the word is Ṣudfa but is corrected to Ṣadaqa by Yāqūt.

al-Madā'inī's Kitāb al-maghāzī was in his possession in eight volumes in the handwriting of ^CAbbās al-Nāsī.¹ Al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār, appears to have been the chief transmitter of the material collected by al-Madā'inī as well as Aḥmad ibn Abī Khaythama and Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥārith al-Kharrāz (257 A.H.).²

Although the writing of sīra as an independent work did not stop at any time, along with it, scholars who devoted books to other subjects such as the history of the world or Arab genealogy, started to use the sīra as an introduction to their works.

Abū al-Walīd Muḥammad ibn ^CAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Azraqī (d.247/861),³ who took his grandfather as his main authority, compiled a Kitāb Akhbār Mecca wa mā jā' fihā min al-Āthār. It was also relevant to the sīra, as al-Azraqī is considered one of the early transmitters of both Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī.

Abū Ja^Cfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb (d.245^s A.H.) compiled a Kitāb al-Muḥabbar, which contains useful information related to the sīra. He also wrote al-Munammaq fī Akhbār Quraysh.

-
1. Fihrist, p.148, in Irshād, vol.5, p.125, it is Ibn ^CAbbās al-Yābis instead of ^CAbbās al-Nāsī. Regardless of this comment, these books seemed to be several sections belonging to one book, probably the Kitāb Akhbār al-Nabī
 2. Irshād, vol.5, p.309.
 3. A native Meccan historian. Fihrist, p.162.
 4. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Azraqī (d. 222/837) one of the trusted friends of al-Shāfi^Cī. Tahdhīb, vol.1, p.79.
 5. A scholar from Baghdād, well acquainted with Arab genealogy and poetry. His mother (Ḥabīb) was a mawlā of Banū Hāshim. Irshād, vol.6, p.473, Fihrist, p.155.

Ahmad ibn al-Hārith al-Kharrāz (d.257)¹ was one of the chief transmitters of al-Madā'inī. He was described as reliable. He contributed to the writing of sīra with two books: Kitāb mā Nahā al-Nabī ^Canhu² and Kitāb maghāzī al-Nabī wa Sarāyāhu wa Dhikr Azwājihi.³

A scholar who followed the system of Ibn Ḥabīb, was Abū Muhammad ^CAbd Allāh ibn Muslim, known as Ibn Qutayba⁴ (d.276 A.H.). That was in his book al-Ma^Cārif. In the first part he relied on Kitāb al-Muḥtadā' of Wahb ibn Munabbih. This seems to be the case, although he does not quote Kitāb al-Muḥtadā' by its title. He also compiled a book on Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa.⁵ This book on Dalā'il seems to have been lost.

A book on shamā'il al-Nabī (Qualities of the Prophet) by the title of al-Shamā'il al-Nabawiyya wa-al-Khaṣā'il al-Muṣṭafawiyya⁶ was compiled by Abū ^CIsa Muhammad ibn ^CIsa ibn Sawra al-Sulamī known as al-Tirmidhī (d.279 A.H.⁷). In his collection of Ḥadīth he also preserved numerous traditions dealing with the same subject.

-
1. A scholar and poet from Baghdād, a mawlā of al-Manṣūr. Irshād, vol.1, p.409. Fihrist, p.152.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid. in Irshād wa Azwājihi appears instead of wa Dhikr Azwājihi.
 4. He was born in Kufa in 213/828. A scholar of language and exegesis. Fihrist, p.115. Ma^Cārif introduction, Wafayāt, vol.1, p.314.
 5. Fihrist, p.115. EI¹, "Ibn Qutayba".
 6. Edited by ^CIzzat ^CUbayd, Syria (1968/1388) entitled al-Shamā'il al-Muḥammadiyya.
 7. A scholar from Tirmidh of Khurāsān, Fihrist, p.325. Tadhkira, vol.2, p.633. Kashf, p.1059.

A scholar who died in the same year as al-Tirmidhī and Aḥmad ibn Abī Khaythama was al-Balādhurī, Abū al-Hasan Aḥmad ibn Yahyā ibn Jābir (d. 279 A.H.).¹ He devoted some pages of his book Futūḥ al-Buldān² to the Prophet's campaigns, while in his book Ansāb al-Ashrāf³ he started with the life of the Prophet. He was described as greatly influenced by Ibn Sa^cd in both books.*

Like al-Balādhurī, was Aḥmad ibn Abī Ya^cqūb ibn Ja^cfar, al-Ya^cqūbī (d. 284/897),⁴ whose sīra is incorporated in his history of the world, the second part of which begins with the birth of the Prophet and brings the history of Islam down to the year (259/872).

Abū al-Qāsim Thābit ibn Ḥazm ibn ^cAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yahyā al-^cAwfī al-Sarqustī (d. 314/927),⁵ also wrote a book of Dalā'il.⁷ It is worth mentioning that the compilation of this

-
1. See introduction of his work Futūḥ al-Buldān, Irshād, vol.2, pp.127-132, Fihrist, p.164.
 2. This work is edited by al-Ṭabbā^c, ^cAbd Allāh and ^cUmar, published in Beirut by Dār al-Nashr lī al-Jāmi^ciyīn, 1958.
 3. A portion of this work is edited by W. Ahlwardt.
 4. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.15.
 5. A historian and geographer. He spent his youth in Armenia and in the service of the Tāhirīds in Khurāsān. Irshād, vol.2, p.156. ET¹, "al-Ya^ckūbī".
 6. He was one of the leading Mālīkite scholars in al-Andalus, and specialist in ḥadīth as well as fiqh. He acted as qāḍī in his birth place Sarqusta. Dībāj, p.102, Tadhkira, vol.3, p.869.
 7. This book was ascribed by Ḥājī Khalīfa to Abū Muḥammad Qāsim ibn Thābit al-Sarqustī (d.302) (the son) and so did al-Suhaylī. Kashf, vol.1, p.760; Text, see for example, vol.1, p.59; vol.3, pp.33, 193.

book was first started by his son Qāsim ibn Thābit who died in 302 A.H.¹ leaving his book unfinished, a work which was undertaken by his father. Abū ʿAlī al-Qālī described this book as being of no rival in the whole Andalus.²

A celebrated scholar whose work is considered the most important of all these works which deal with the history of the world including the Prophet's biography and campaigns, is Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr well known as al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923).³ His history is entitled Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk. This work started with the history of the Prophets and rulers of the earliest period and then comes the history of the Sassanian period and then the life of the Prophet from which he brings the history of Islam down to the year (302/915). Besides the inestimable value of this work, al-Ṭabarī is also famous for his commentary on the Qur'ān which was described as a 'mine of information'.⁴ This work is entitled Jāmi' al-Bayān ʿan Tafsīr al-Qur'ān. In both works al-Ṭabarī preserved numerous fragments from the work of Ibn Ishāq. Whereas Ibn Hishām quotes Ibn Ishāq according to the riwāya of al-Bakkā'ī' (d. 183 A.H.), al-Ṭabarī uses a copy that was made

-
1. Dībāj, p.223, Irshād, vol.6, p.154.
 2. Dībāj, p.102.
 3. He was born in (224/839) at Āmul in the Province of Ṭabaristān. He devoted himself to an extremely prolific and versatile literary activity. Irshād, vol.6, p.423 seq.; Fihrist, p.326.
 4. EI^I, "al-Ṭabarī".

by Salama ibn al-Fadl al-Asadī al-Ansārī (d. 191/812).¹

A book of Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa had been ascribed by Hājī Khalīfa² to Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Hammād ibn Ishāq (d. 323/934)³ although other writers⁴ in connection with his biography did not mention this work among his compilations.

One of al-Tabarī's generation was Abū al-Hasan ^CAlī ibn al-Husayn (d. 345/956) well known as al-Mas^Cūdī.⁵ He contributed to the writing of the history of the world by a

-
1. A third copy was made from Ibn Ishāq's biography of the Prophet, by Yūnus ibn Bukayr. This was used by al-Suhaylī in his Rawḍ and Ibn al-Athīr in his Uṣd al-Ghāba and Ibn Sa^C d. A copy of part of this recension exists in the Qarawiyūn mosque at Fez in Morocco, lately a summary of it was edited by A. Guillaume under the title of "New Light on the Life of Muḥammad" while the whole manuscript was edited/^{first} by Hamīd Allāh and then by Zakkār. A fourth copy was made by Harūn ibn Abī ^CIṣā and used by Ibn Sa^C d. Cf. Life of Muḥammad, introduction. Another two copies were made by Muḥammad ibn Fulayḥ ibn Sa^C d, Text, vol.1, p.40. Yāqūt stated in connection with al-Tabarī that he based his history on the riwāyā of Salama. Irshād, vol.6, p.430.
 2. Kashf, vol.1, p.477.
 3. A Mālīkite scholar from Baghdad, described as knowledgeable in Hadīth. Ibid.
 4. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.804, Dībāj, p.85.
 5. A historian and geographer, described as one of the most versatile authors of the fourth century hijrī. His lineage Mas^Cūdī indicates that he was a descendant from ^CAbd Allāh ibn Mas^Cūd the Companion of the Prophet. Irshād, vol.5, p.147.

large work which is said to have filled thirty volumes.¹ That was Kitāb Akhbār al-Zamān wa-man abādahu al-Ḥidhān min al-Umam al-Māḍiya wa al-Ajyāl al-Khāliya wa al-Mamālik al-Dāthira,² a part of which was devoted to the ṣīra of the Prophet as well as an account of the history of the early Prophets.³ Later he abridged this work in his book entitled al-Awsaṭ.⁴ In his book Murūj al-Dhahab wa Ma'ādin al-Jawhar⁵ he preserved the substance of these works.

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad, known as Abū Bakr al-Naqqāsh (d. 351/962)⁶ also contributed to the literature of dalā'il by his book Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa.⁷ He also compiled a commentary on the Qur'ān. Unlike most of these scholars who have been mentioned, he was described as an unauthentic transmitter of ḥadīth. Moreover he was accused of transmitting unacknowledged (munkar) traditions to which he attached seemingly impeccable isnāds.⁸ Nevertheless al-Suhaylī quoted him several times.

-
1. Kashf, vol.1, p.27. The introduction of his works Murūj; al-Tanbīh and Akhbār al-Zamān.
 2. Ibid. A portion of this work was edited by a Bureau, published by Dār al-Andalus, Beirut 1386/1966.
 3. Kashf, vol.1, p.27; EI¹, "al-Mas'ūdī".
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid. This book was edited first by Barbier De Meynard, published in Paris, 1861-1871. It was also edited in Cairo, by Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn, 1948 and in Beirut by Yūsuf As'ad, 1978.
 6. A native of Basra of Iraq. His attitude in his writings, lacking a scholarly disposition, was described as being most like the style of story tellers. Fihrist, p.50, Irshād vol.6 p.496, Ta'rīkh Baghdād, vol.2, p.205.
 7. Ibid.
 8. Ta'rīkh Baghdād, vol.2, p.205. Irshād, vol.6, p.496.

Another scholar who contributed to the writing of sīra was ^CAbd al-Malik ibn Muhammad, better known as Abū Sa^Cīd al-Nisābūrī al-Kharkūshī (d.407).¹ A native from Kharkūsh of Nisābūr. He compiled a book of Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa wa Sharaf al-Muṣṭafa.²

A highly regarded scholar Ahmad ibn ^CAbd Allāh ibn Ahmad, known as Abū Nu^Caym al-Aṣbahānī, was born in (336/947).³ The scholars of ḥadīth praised him by saying: Abū Nu^Caym remained for fourteen years with no rival in the east or in the west in the field of ḥadīth and isnād.⁴ When he compiled his book Hilyat al-Awliyā' people offered as much as four hundred dinārs⁵ to obtain it. Besides this book he wrote others. Among them are Ma^Crifat al-Ṣaḥāba, Faḍā'il al-Ṣaḥāba and Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa.⁶ Abū Nu^Caym died at the age of ninety-four in the year (430/1041).

A scholar who belonged to the same generation was Abū al-^CAbbās Ja^Cfar ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Mu^Ctazz al-Mustaghfirī (d. 432/1043),⁷ who made a notable contribution to the field of sīra. All his works in this connection were recorded by Hājī

1. Al-^CIbar, vol.3, p.96.

2. Ibid. It was abridged by al-Qāḍī ^CIyād ibn Mūsa. Ibn Khayr, vol.2, p.497, translated into Persian by Najm al-Dīn Maḥmūd entitled Sharaf al-Nabī.

3. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1092.

4. Ibid., p.1094.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p.1097; Kashf, vol.1, p.760. Dalā'il was published in 1950.

7. A scholar of ḥadīth, described as trustworthy but he transmitted a number of forged 'mawḍu^Cāt' ḥadīths without criticism. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1102.

Khalīfa. These are Shamā'il al-Nabī,¹ Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa² and Khuṭab al-Nabī.³ He described the book on Dalā'il as consisting of seventeen chapters "bab", seven of which were devoted to Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa before the beginning of the revelation, the rest to the Miracles of the Prophet.⁴

It can be seen clearly how this branch of Sīra, namely the dalā'il al-nubuwwa and shamā'il al-nabī attracted the attention of scholars of the time. Amongst those who also wrote on dalā'il was Abū Dharr ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ^CAbd Allāh, known as al-Harawī (d. 434/045),⁵ whose work is entitled Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa.⁶ Another work on dalā'il was compiled by Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ^CAlī al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1079).⁷ His works, of which there were more than twenty-one - were described as unique.⁸ His work is entitled Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa wa Ma^Crifat Aḥwāl Ṣāḥib al-Sharī^Ca.⁹

Among those who contributed to the literature of dalā'il was Abū al-Ḥasan ^CAlī ibn Aḥmad known as al-Māwardī

-
1. Kashf, vol.2, p.1059, Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1102.
 2. Kashf, vol.1, p.760. A manuscript of it is available in Istanbul. Maṣādir, p.44.
 3. Kashf, vol.1, p.715.
 4. Ibid., p.760.
 5. He was one of the Mālikite scholars and a theologian adherent to the Asha^Carite doctrine. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1103.
 6. Ibid. cf. EI^I, "Sīra".
 7. He was described as being of a comprehensive acquaintance with ḥadith and fiqh; well known as a Shāfi^Cite scholar Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1132.
 8. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1132.
 9. It was abridged by Sirāj al-Dīn ^CUmar ibn ^CAlī known as Ibn al-Mulaqqin (d.804). Kashf, vol.1, p.760. Edited by Aḥmad Ṣaqr, Cairo, (1970/1389).

(d. 450/1058). He wrote A^Clām al-Nubuwwa.¹

An illustrious Andalusian scholar, Abū Muḥammad ^CAlī ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064)² also contributed to the sīra. His book is entitled Jawāmi^C al-Sīra.³ It is evident from the title that his work was meant to focus on the most important features of the life of the Prophet.

Another scholar who wrote on the sīra, although he was renowned as a transmitter of ḥadīth was Abū ^CUmar Yūsuf ibn ^CAbd al-Barr al-Namarī (d. 463/1074).⁴ He was described as without rival in al-Andalus.⁵ At the time when Abū Bakr al-Khatīb was considered as the leading scholar in Baghdād, Ibn ^CAbd al-Barr was described as his counterpart in al-Andalus.⁶ Like al-Wāqidī and al-Madā'inī, he extended his literary activity over numerous branches of knowledge.⁷ His book on the maghāzī was entitled al-Durar fī Ikhtisār al-maghāzī wa al-Siyar.⁸ Besides this work, Ibn ^CAbd al-Barr compiled also an ^CArab genealogy. That was his work al-Qaṣd wa al-Amam fī Ansāb al-^CArab.⁹ He also made a contribution to the biographies of the Prophet's Companions in his book al-Istī^Cāb fī ma^Crifat al-Aṣḥāb.¹⁰ His works were described as

-
1. Published in Beirut, 1973. cf. Ahlwardt, No.2527.
 2. He developed the Zāhirite school of law (fiqh) into a school of theology. Muslim Theology, p.208.
 3. Edited by Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad, Cairo (1956/1375).
 4. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.348; al-Dībāj, p.359; Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1128.
 5. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.350.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Ibid. p.348
 8. Kashf, vol.1, p.750.
 9. Al-Dībāj, p.357.
 10. Al-Suhaylī wrote an appendix to this book; see Text, vol.4, p. 408

unique.¹

Another Andalusian scholar who was one of the most celebrated figures of Malikite fiqh in Muslim Spain was ^cIyād ibn Mūsā al-Yahṣabī (d.544).² He was pre-eminently a traditionist and faqīh. His best known work on sīra is his book Al-Shifā' fī Ta^crīf Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā³ which is mainly dealing with the Prophet's miracles, his infallibility, how God praised him and finally the obligation of his followers towards him.

An Andalusian scholar of the same generation who made two copies of the Sīra was Abū al-Walīd Hishām ibn Ahmad al-Kinānī, known as Abū al-Walīd al-Waqashī (d. 489/1102).⁴ It is obvious that Abū al-Walīd was not only a transmitter of the Sīra, but also that he was a commentator. This is very evident from al-Suhaylī's frequent references to him.⁵

This survey must of its very nature be provisional. It is not possible to say definitely that all works about the sīra prior to al-Suhaylī have been included. It is hoped that it will give a general view of the development of sīra writing up to al-Suhaylī's time, it serves to indicate the sīra sources that may have been available to al-Suhaylī and helps towards a later assessment of his contribution to this genre.

1. Al-Dībāj, p.357.

2. He was appointed as Qādī of Ceuta and then Granada. He remained inflexibly attached to al-Moravid dynasty throughout his life; al-Māliqī, p.95; El², "Iyād".

3. 'Alī al-Qārī' wrote a commentary on this book.

4. He was a leading figure in Khatāba and fiqh. He acted as Judge in Talbira of Tulyūla. Irshād, vol.7, p.249.

5. See below, pp.50-2.

CHAPTER III

AL-SUHAYLĪ AS A COMMENTATOR AND HIS USE OF HIS SOURCES

The body of al-Rawḍ is preceded by a shortish introduction. Within the small compass of it, al-Suhaylī gives the principles underlying his commentary. He said: "My aim is to explain the difficult words, obscure inflexions i^c rāb, abstruse speech or a recondite genealogy. I also aim to draw attention to any question of fiqh whenever it occurs and to finish any incomplete information whenever it is possible to do so".¹

At one point however our author seems to have decided spontaneously to add two further principles to which he did not adhere. The first was not to explain any of the poems of the nonbelievers, but later he exempted those who became Muslims.² The second was to include the material in his book al-Ta^c rīf wa al-l^c lām, in his commentary whenever it was appropriate,³ but the idea seems to be forgotten later and he continues with his previous practice, i.e. simply referring the reader to the first book. However, it is obvious that al-Suhaylī adopted the same method he followed in his above mentioned work. Whereas the former was confined to the identification of obscure names occurring in the Qur'ān, al-Rawḍ was an explanation on a large scale including almost everything that needed to be explained in the Sīra.

Being well aware of the fact that the ultimate perfection in any work is unattainable, al-Suhaylī was hesitant at the

-
1. Text, vol.1, p.33.
 2. Ibid., vol.5, p.73.
 3. Ibid., p.248.

start. He described himself as a pioneer attempting to explore an unpaved way, when suddenly an idea occurred to him; he thought that the Caliph Abū Ya^Cqūb Yūsuf ibn ^CAbd al-Mu'min, ¹ might receive his book, he might also add it to his library. Thus the idea came to overwhelm him. Further encouraged, he approached the work enthusiastically.² It is not surprising that as a result he finished the compilation of his book in five months only, which started in al-Muharram in the year 569/1182 and ended in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the same year.³ At that time he was sixty one.

At the beginning, his commentary was so extensive that it covers more pages than the part of the Sīra he explains, gradually he became less enthusiastic and contents himself with brief comments.

Al-Suhaylī was so pleased with his work that he praised it saying: "Although my book turned out to be one of the smallest size books, it is a vessel full of knowledge".⁴ He also described it as including unprecedented anecdotes besides grammar, fiqh, language, and the names of men and their genealogy, the substance of which was extracted from more than one hundred and twenty books beside his own contribution.⁵ Al-Suhaylī added that if it was not his own book he would have praised it more.⁶ To emphasise this he implied the forementioned opinion in the title of his book.

Al-Suhaylī provided four chains of authority on which he

-
1. See p. 14 above.
 2. Text, vol.1, pp.34, 35.
 3. Ibid., p.36.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Ibid.

received the text of the Sīra.¹ Three of them ended with Abū Sa^c īd al-Barqī² on the authority of Ibn Hishām, the fourth ended with Abū al-Walīd Hishām ibn Ahmad al-Kinānī³ but al-Suhaylī did not state the authorities of the latter. It seems likely that, that was the version of Yūnus used by our author who quoted it by name more than seventy times. This could further be proved by the fact that al-Suhaylī several times explains - without noticing - some accounts seemingly occurring in another version of the Sīra but altogether absent from the version of Ibn Hishām.⁴ Moreover, our author made a reference to what he called al-Kitāb al-kabīr of Ibn Ishāq. On one occasion he said: Ibn Ishāq narrated fī al-Kitāb al-kabīr on the authority of Shahr ibn Hawshab who had it via Abū Dharr from the Prophet who said: "The first to write with a pen was Idrīs"⁵ i.e. the prophet. However, as it is an isolated example one should not go so far as to suggest that al-Suhaylī might have had access to the mother text of Ibn Ishāq. Nevertheless, his text included fragments of material from the original, omitted or unknown to Ibn Hishām. Although A. Guillaume did not consider him one of the writers from whom some of the original could be recovered.⁶ Nevertheless he quoted a few excerpts.⁷ Al-Suhaylī often quotes such material preceded by the phrase: "Ibn Ishāq said in a narration which does not come via Ibn Hishām" or sometimes "not via al-Bakkā'ī". Some of these citations however, proved to be from the version of Yūnus too.⁸ Other quotations were probably from the version of Ibrāhīm ibn Sa^c d (d.184) either directly or via

1. Text, vol.1, p.36.

2. Cf. p.49-50 below.

3. See p.50-2 below

4. See p.67-86 below.

5. Text, vol.1, p.78.

6. Life of Muḥammad, xxxi introduction.

7. Ibid. See for instance p.223, 224, 229, 311.

8. Cf. p.68 below.

the compilations of Abū ^cUmar Yūsuf ibn ^cAbd al-Barr,¹ whom al-Suhaylī quoted through his books, al-Istī^cāb, al-Inbāh, al-Nisā', al-Tamhīd, al-Durrar and finally al-Ajwiba. Several times al-Suhaylī referred to the version of Ibrāhīm ibn Sa^cd by name.² Another version which might have been in circulation at the time of al-Suhaylī was that of Muḥammad ibn Salama al-Harrānī (d.191).³ It is also possible that some of this material described as not via al-Bakkā'ī, was from the version of Salama ibn al-Faḍl (d.191) via al-Ṭabarī's History, a book which al-Suhaylī has used extensively for information on the Sīra. For the same purpose he referred to al-Wāqidī, whom he sometimes quoted without specifying the exact source of his information. On some occasions, however, he mentioned the book of Intiqāl al-Nūr,⁴ the book of al-Mawlid⁵ and the book of al-Ridda.⁶ He also referred to al-Zuhrī in his Siyar and described it as the first Sīra to be written in Islam.⁷ This suggests that our author might have had a copy of it. There are also many citations from Mūsā ibn ^cUqba on various occasions.⁸ Al-Suhaylī quoted a book of maghāzī which he ascribed to Abū Ishāq al-Zajjāj,⁹ a work which was not mentioned by Ḥājī Khalīfa or those scholars who produced the biography of al-Zajjāj. Thus it could be suggested that the word maghāzī appearing in al-Rawḍ in this connection was only a

-
1. Text, vol.5, p.295. cf. vol.4, pp.204, 205.
 2. Ibid., vol.2, p.330; vol.5, p.416; vol.6, p.206.
 3. Fragments of it have been published, incorporated in the version of Yūnus, written in the year 454 on the authority of Abū Bakr ibn al-Khatīb.
 4. Text, vol.1, p.93.
 5. Ibid., p.61.
 6. Ibid., vol.5, pp.172, 461; vol.7, p.362.
 7. Ibid., vol.2, p.240. Published in part in 1980 by S. Zakkār.
 8. Text, vol.2, p.399; vol.3, pp.144, 162.
 9. Ibid., vol.1, p.163; vol.5, p.139.

misrepresentation of the word ma^cānī,¹ another work of al-Zajjāj. A man of the same importance as al-Tabarī in History and the Sīra was al-Bukhārī, whose compilations form some of the most important sources of our author. These books were al-Suhaylī's primary sources on the Sīra. However, he also made a few references to others, such as Siyar al-Taymī² and Sharaf al-Muṣṭafā of Abū Sa^cīd al-Nisābūrī.

As for commentaries on the Sīra, al-Suhaylī made frequent references to al-Barqī but nowhere does he record his full name. However, in connection with the sanad (chain of authorities) on which he received the Sīra he said: "We heard this text (sīra) from al-Imām Abū Bakr Muhammad ibn ^cAbd Allāh ibn al-^cArabi³ who had it via this Sanad". He then provides three chains all ending with al-Barqī on the authority of ^cAbd al-Malik ibn Hishām.⁴ It is noticeable that in the first chain al-Suhaylī recorded the full name of al-Barqī as Abū Sa^cīd ^cAbd al-Rahīm. In the second and third he only referred to him as al-Barqī. It seems likely that al-Barqī with whom the three chains end was the same man, that is Abū Sa^cīd ^cAbd al-Rahīm al-Barqī and not any of his brothers,⁵ and that al-Suhaylī contented himself with referring to him by his lineage only after he had mentioned his full name. Thus Abū Sa^cīd ^cAbd al-Rahīm al-Barqī seems to be the second commentator on Sīra, while the first was Ibn Hishām himself.

However, a total picture of al-Barqī's commentary cannot be recovered from al-Suhaylī's citations. Because he used it

1. Ma^cānī al-Qur'ān wa l^crābuhu, edited by ^cAbd al-Jalīl Abdū 1974.

2. See p. 24 above.

3. He was a leading scholar in al-Andalus, was described as an erudite scholar. He died in Fās in the year 543 A.H. Wafayāt, vol.2, p.619.

4. Text, vol.1, p.36.

5. See p. 33 above.

only in the beginning and the end of his work. For some reason, however, the work ceased to be quoted as a reference for some time.¹

The material taken from al-Barqī indicates that he quotes from Ibn al-Kalbī,² Ibn Ishāq³ and Ibn Hishām.⁴ Occasionally he illustrates the meaning of unusual works,⁵ adds some historical information,⁶ a genealogical note⁷ or comments on a verse of poetry.⁸

Another commentary al-Suhaylī referred to was that of Abū al-Walīd al-Waqashī. It is remarkable that al-Suhaylī refers to this work only via Abū Baḥr Sufyān ibn al-^cĀṣ (d. 520/1131),⁹ who made a copy of the Sīra according to the text of al-Waqashī which was incorporated within his commentary. As al-Suhaylī stated: Abū Baḥr twice revised his copy and collated it "qābal" with the original of al-Waqashī.¹⁰ Although several times al-Suhaylī quotes this work as ḥāshiyat al-Shaykh Abī Baḥr,¹¹ more frequently he introduces the material he cited

-
1. The commentary of al-Suhaylī is incorporated with the sīra of Ibn Hishām in seven volumes. Al-Suhaylī did not quote al-Barqī in vols.4, 5, or 6.
 2. Text, vol.1, pp.252, 403; vol.2, p.142.
 3. Ibid., vol.2, p.358; vol.3, p.92.
 4. Ibid., vol.1, p.432.
 5. Ibid., vol.2, p.13; vol.3, p.112; vol.7, pp.82, 214.
 6. Ibid., vol.2, pp.139, 142, 358.
 7. Ibid., vol.1, pp.403, 432; vol.3, p.83; vol.7, pp.202, 218.
 8. Ibid., vol.1, pp.173, 224, 236; vol.3, p.92; vol.7, p.201.
 9. A native from Qurṭuba, was described as knowledgeable in ḥadīth. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1271, ^c Ibār, vol.4, p.46.
 10. See Text, vol.1, pp.314, 290.
 11. See e.g. ibid., vol.1, pp.190, 312; vol.2, pp.202, 356.

from it with a comment indicating that al-Shaykh Abū Bahr was merely a transmitter of this commentary on the authority of al-Waqashī,¹ e.g. in connection with the meaning of the word "jurūb" he explained it saying: "al-jurūb" means "black stones", thus Abū Bahr transcribed it in his hāshiya on the authority of al-Waqashī.² In another citation with a reference to the meaning of a verse of poetry al-Suhaylī stated: "I found a commentary on this verse in the hāshiya of al-Shaykh's book which he had written on the authority of Abū al-Walīd, it is as follows". Then he provided it in four lines and said: "this is the end of the quotation from hāshiyat al-Shaykh".³ However, it is also possible that Abū Bahr himself wrote a commentary. Al-Suhaylī in one place implied this saying: "In the hāshiya of al-Shaykh, he said in the hāshiya of the original. He meant the original of Abū al-Walīd - etc."⁴

The material that al-Suhaylī borrowed for his commentary from al-Waqashī, indicates that the notes of the latter were brief. There were also minor differences between the text of the Sīra that al-Suhaylī has used and the text of al-Waqashī, mainly concerning the writing of some words of similar letters in Arabic, like khā, hā and jīm or qāf and fā' etc.⁵ Occasionally al-Suhaylī quotes al-Waqashī to illustrate the meaning of unusual words,⁶ adds genealogical notes or verses

-
1. See e.g. Text, vol.3, pp.196, 236; vol.4, pp.17, 98, 99; vol.5, pp.122, 295, 297; vol.1, p.398.
 2. Ibid., vol.1, p.232. See Tāj al-ʿArūs, vol.2, p.148, 157.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.309; for similar citations see e.g. ibid., vol.5, pp.122, 295, 297.
 4. Ibid., vol.6, p.147.
 5. See e.g. ibid., pp.567, 371, 259, 149.
 6. See e.g. ibid., vol.5, pp.196, 407; vol.2, p.57; vol.1, p.258.



of poetry;¹ more rarely to explain a line in the Sīra or correct an error.² Whereas some references seem to have disappeared, the work of al-Waqashī is one of the few that accompanied our author throughout his commentary.

However, as al-Suhaylī planned his commentary to deal with grammar, language fiqh, literature and genealogy, he referred to all books available on these various subjects as well as history. Above all al-Suhaylī referred to the Qur'ān. Sometimes when there is a difference of opinion regarding some accounts in the Sīra, al-Suhaylī resorts to the Qur'ān to say the final word.³ He also quotes the Qur'ān to support his views on legal and theological implications he deduced from the Sīra⁴ besides the usage of Arabic language; meaning of words⁵ and inflexion.⁶ For the explanation of verses of the Qur'ān occurring in the Sīra al-Suhaylī referred to the Qur'ān Commentaries: mainly that of al-Tabarī and Yahyā ibn Sallām.⁷ He also quoted al-Bukhārī,⁸ Abū Bakr al-Naqqāsh,⁹ ^CAbd ibn Humayd al-Kishshī¹⁰ and finally Ma^C ānī al-Qur'ān¹¹ and I^C rāb al-Qur'ān of Abū Ja^Cfar al-Nahhās.¹² It is worth noting that pertaining to Qur'ān exegesis our author quoted oral information from his teacher Abū Bakr ibn al-^CArabī.¹³ As has

-
1. See e.g. Text, vol.1, p.24.
 2. Ibid., vol.4, p.567; vol.6, p.339.
 3. Ibid., vol.1, pp.175, 127; vol.2, p.435.
 4. Ibid., vol.1, pp.253, 282; vol.2, p.397.
 5. Ibid., vol.1, p.188.
 6. Ibid., pp.278, 285; vol.2, p.397.
 7. Ibid., vol.6, pp.208, 255; vol.7, pp.86, 208, 276, 379.
 8. Ibid., vol.2, p.368; vol.3, p.109; vol.4, p.425.
 9. Ibid., vol.1, pp.88, 116, 192, 197; vol.2, pp.278, 325.
 10. Ibid., vol.5, pp.462, 227; vol.6, p.35; vol.7, pp.93, 94.
 11. Ibid., vol.3, p.429. Cf. p.457.
 12. Ibid., vol.6, pp.84, 245, 475, 492; vol.7, p.87.
 13. Ibid., vol.7, pp.93, 300, 510.

been mentioned he refers to him as "Shaykhunā", i.e. our teacher. He also made some references to him concerning ḥadīth,¹ fiqh and language.² Similar to Ibn al-^cArabī was Abū Bakr ibn Ṭāhir al-Ishbīlī³ from whom al-Suhaylī received information by hearing also.

For the same purposes as the Qur'ān, al-Suhaylī referred to ḥadīth. It is obvious that his knowledge in this field was vast. He categorized many ḥadīths in the Sīra and questioned their isnāds. Unexpectedly, sometimes he seems to have forgotten to apply this method to ḥadīths he quoted from other sources, particularly when he needed a certain ḥadīth to support his view. On such occasions he rarely indicates whether the ḥadīth is weak.⁴ His sources in ḥadīth are mainly the two collections of sound traditions, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim. Then comes Sunan al-Tirmidhī, al-Bazzār in his Musnad, al-Nisā'ī in his Sunan, al-Harawī in his book al-Gharībayn, and Abū al-Ḥasan al-Dār^qutnī in his Sunan. The quotations from the latter are numerous but most of the material could be traced to his book al-Mu'talif wa-al-Mukhtalif,⁵ while others are from his book Rijāl al-Muwatṭa'.⁶ Our author also referred to ḥadīth commentaries: Mainly Qāsim ibn Thābit in his commentary on Gharīb al-Ḥadīth entitled al-Dalā'il fī Sharḥ mā aghfal Abū ^cUbayd wa-Ibn Qutayba min Gharīb al-Ḥadīth,⁷ which he quoted on various occasions for meanings of words, explanations of ḥadīth or historical information. It is from him that al-Suhaylī preserved the

1. Text, vol.5, p.130.

2. Ibid., vol.6, p.242.

3. Ibid., vol.2, pp 304, 316.

4. See e.g. ibid., vol.4, p.383, 421 ; vol.6, p.390.

5. See e.g. ibid., vol.1, pp.91, 99; vol.4, pp.163, 193.

6. See e.g. ibid., vol.2, p.55; vol.5, p.79.

7. Al-Suhaylī quotes it as al-Dalā'il. The full title is preserved by Hāji Khalīfa, Kashf, vol.1, p.760.

longest quotation in his Rawḍ consisting of more than fifty lines, an account concerning the Prophet offering himself to the tribes; mainly the meeting of the Prophet and Abū Bakr with Banū Shaybān ibn Tha^c laba.¹ Our author described the account as deserving inclusion in his book, i.e. al-Rawḍ. A remark implying that he was selecting his material carefully. Other books of ḥadīth commentaries used by al-Suhaylī were Sharḥ al-Jāmi^c al-Ṣaḥīḥ of Ibn Battal² and A^c lām al-Ḥadīth of al-Khaṭābī.³ The forementioned books were his primary sources on ḥadīth, however, he also made some references to others such as Gharīb al-Ḥadīth of Ibn Qutayba,⁴ al-Jāmi^c of Ma^c mar ibn Rāshid,⁵ al-Sunan of Abū Dā'ūd,⁶ Gharīb al-Ḥadīth of Abū ^cUbayd⁷ and al-Musnad of al-Hārith ibn ^cAbd Allāh al-Tamīmī.⁸ However, with regard to Ḥadīth al-Suhaylī did not confine himself to the books restricted to that subject, he consulted others, such as fiqh and tafsīr books.

Al-Suhaylī referred to ḥadīth to support his views in language,⁹ grammar,¹⁰ historical information,¹¹ genealogy¹² to explain the meaning of a verse from the Qur'ān,¹³ or to

-
1. Text, vol.4, pp.61-64. See also pp.266-70 below.
 2. See e.g. Text , vol.1, p.197; vol. 3, pp.430, 450; vol.4, pp.26, 450.
 3. See e.g. ibid., vol.1, p.151; vol.2, p.311; vol.4, p.254.
 4. Ibid., for instance vol.1, pp.58, 216; vol.2, pp.76, 143, 184.
 5. Ibid., vol.1, p.255; vol.2, pp.187, 280; vol.4, p.265.
 6. Ibid., p.259; vol.3, p.182; vol.4, pp.58, 100.
 7. Ibid., vol.2, p.71; vol.3, p.433; vol.4, pp.248, 387.
 8. Ibid., vol.2, p.71; vol.3, p.433; vol.4, pp.248, 387.
 9. Ibid., vol.1, pp.55, 58, 116, 279.
 10. Ibid., p.286.
 11. Ibid., pp.61, 63.
 12. Ibid., pp.102, 116.
 13. Ibid., pp.116, 188, 382.

support some other accounts in the Sīra.¹ Occasionally al-Suhaylī seems to rely on a weak ḥadīth to build a whole theory² or sometimes infers a solution to a fiqh problem from such ḥadīth.³

In connection with fiqh problems al-Suhaylī referred to Mālik and al-Shāfi^cī. He did not mention the source of his information on the authority of the latter while he mentioned al-Muwatta' for Mālik and al-Mudawwana, with both he seems to be very familiar. Rarely does he quote al-Shāfi^cī's opinion without quoting Mālik's. Most of the quotations from al-Shāfi^cī are found in his book al-Umm.⁴ Besides his sources on fiqh, al-Suhaylī relied on his own opinion and deduced numerous legal points from many accounts in the Sīra.⁵ Frequently he indicates the differences of opinions about Islamic judgements, i.e. aḥkāṃ referring to Mālik and al-Shāfi^cī.

For historical information related to the Sīra al-Suhaylī referred to al-Ṭabarī in his Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk quoting it simply as Ta'rīkh. He preserved numerous fragments from the Mabḍā' section of Ibn Ishāq through these citations from al-Ṭabarī.⁶ For the same purpose he referred to al-Bukhārī and al-Mas^cūdī. Although al-Suhaylī specified the source of his information on the authority of al-Bukhārī as his Ṣaḥīḥ⁷ and his Ta'rīkh,⁸ he did not mention to which work of

1. Text, vol.1, pp.67, 151, 164, 349, 375.

2. Ibid., vol.4, pp.383, 421, ; vol.2, p.272.

3. Ibid., vol.6, p.483.

4. See Chapter IV, below. The book Al-Umm as transmitted by al-Rabī^c ibn Sulaymān al-Murādī was published in Cairo (1321/1901).

5. See Chapter IV, below.

6. Text, e.g. vol.1, pp.47, 61, 65, 69, 70, 71, 72, 76.

7. Ibid., e.g. vol.1, pp.358, 375.

8. Ibid., e.g. vol.1, pp.114, 382; vol.2, pp.281, 360.

al-Mas^cūdī he was referring. Most of this material can be found in his book; Murūj al-Dhahab. For instance; the story of the daughter of al-Dayzan - one of the Mulūk al-Ṭawā'if in the era prior to Islam - who opened her father's fort for the enemy.¹ Al-Suhaylī quoted the whole story from al-Mas^cūdī, though with minor differences; while Ibn Hishām stated that the duration of the siege was two years,² al-Mas^cūdī said it was one month.³ Al-Suhaylī said it was four years,⁴ but without mentioning his authority on this latter piece of information. The story is preserved in al-Mas^cūdī's above mentioned work.⁵ Another account which was preserved by al-Mas^cūdī and quoted by al-Suhaylī was a short passage in rhymed prose which Ibn Ishāq described as an inscription dating from older times found in the Yemen.⁶ Al-Suhaylī stated that the same passage is preserved in poetic form by al-Mas^cūdī.⁷ He then quoted four verses⁸ while in al-Murūj the poetry is in seven verses.⁹ There are also other minor differences. It is worth remarking that al-Suhaylī added that the passage was found written on the pulpit of the Prophet Hūd,¹⁰ an extra piece of information for which he did not specify his authority. He followed it saying 'as they alleged' (fī mā za^camū). However al-Mas^cūdī specifically said the passage was found written on a black stone at the door of Zifār, the capital of the Yaman at that time.¹¹ These

-
1. Text, vol.1, p.327.
 2. Ibid., p.323.
 3. Murūj, vol.2, p.248.
 4. Text, vol.1, p.327.
 5. Murūj, vol.2, p.248.
 6. Text, vol.1, p.308.
 7. Ibid. cf. Murūj, vol.2, p.63.
 8. Text, vol.1, p.321.
 9. Murūj, vol.2, p.63.
 10. Text, vol.1, p.321.
 11. Murūj, vol.2, p.63.

quotations and many others¹ show that probably al-Suhaylī was using Murūj al-Dhahab of al-Mas^cūdī. To both books, i.e. The History of al-Tabarī and Murūj of al-Mas^cūdī, our author also referred for genealogy particularly of those who lived in the era prior to Islam. As for the genealogy of Quraysh, his main source was Jamharat Nasab Quraysh² of al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār (d.256/870), and Nasab Quraysh³ of his uncle al-Mus^cab al-Zubayrī (d.236/851). On those occasions when there is a conflict between Ibn Ishāq and one of the former on points of genealogy, al-Suhaylī prefers their authority arguing that they were from the same tribe and must therefore be more knowledgeable than Ibn Ishāq.⁴

For theology, al-Suhaylī frequently referred to Abū al-Hasan ^cAlī ibn Ismā^cīl al-Ash^carī, without specifying any of his works. He also referred to al-Qādī al-Bāqillānī (d.403) in his book al-Taqrīb wa al-Irshād,⁵ Abū al-Ma^cālī al-Juwaynī in his book al-Burhān⁶ and Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Fūrak (d.406) in his book al-Fuṣūl.⁷

As regards linguistic questions al-Suhaylī refers to Ibn Jinnī regarding etymology, Ibn Durayd for inflexion, as well as Ya^cqūb ibn al-Sikkīt. Concerning lexicography he refers to Kitāb al-Ayn^{of} al-Khalīl.⁸ Although he used it extensively he

-
1. Cf. Text, vol.1, pp.325-6; Murūj, vol.2, p.324; ibid., p.239; cf. Murūj, vol.2, pp.407-8.
 2. This work is edited by Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, published in Cairo, 1961.
 3. This work is edited by E. Levi-Provencal, published in Cairo by Dar al-Ma^cārif, 1953.
 4. Cf. Text, vol.3, p.354.
 5. Ibid., vol.3, p.219. cf. Wafayāt, vol.1, p.609.
 6. Ibid., vol.7, p.271.
 7. Ibid., vol.2, p.151; vol.3, p.188; vol.5, p.248. cf. Wafayāt, vol.1, p.610.
 8. Ibid., vol.1, pp.113, 122, 138, 175, 177, 184, 228.

always refers to it either by its title or follows the quotation from it saying, "Thus the author of al-^CAyn said",¹ on one occasion however, he quoted al-Khalīl by name though he did not specify al-^CAyn. A book of the same importance as al-^CAyn in this connection is al-Gharīb al-Muṣannaf of Abū ^CUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām.³ Al-Suhaylī referred to the latter author through most of his compilations.*

For all the questions concerning language and grammar al-Suhaylī's primary source was Sibawayhī. The citations from his book show that al-Suhaylī was totally familiar with this work. He often gives the opinion of Sibawayhī before his own. Moreover he sometimes criticises other writers for misinterpreting Sibawayhī's words.⁵ The biographers reported that he debated with his own teacher, Ibn al-Ṭarāwa on this book. However if this is authentic it must have taken place when our author was still a student, as Ibn al-Ṭarāwa died in 528 A.H. and al-Suhaylī was born in 508 A.H.

Al-Suhaylī quoted other books on different occasions such as Kitāb al-Amwāl⁶ of Abū ^CUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, al-Aghānī⁷ of Abū al-Faraj, Adab al-Kātib⁸ of Ibn Qutayba, both

-
1. Text, vol.1, pp.113, 122, 138, 175, 177, 184, 228.
 2. Ibid., vol.5, p.180.
 3. Ibid., vol.1, pp.94, 419; vol.3, pp.32, 357.
 4. Besides the work already mentioned, few references were made to Kitāb al-Ansāb, vol.3, p.33, and Kitāb al-Ibil, vol.3, p.84. In addition to Gharīb al-Ḥadīth and al-Amwāl.
 5. See p.61 below.
 6. Text, vol.4, p.296; vol.5, p.225.
 7. Ibid., vol.1, p.191; vol.3, p.253.
 8. Ibid., vol.2, p.202.

al-Ḥayawān¹ and al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn² of al-Jāhiz, Akhbar Mecca³ of Abū al-Walīd al-Azraqī, Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh⁴ of Ahmad ibn Abī Khaythama and Kitāb al-Amālī⁵ of Abū ^CAlī al-Qālī. For names of plants, al-Suhaylī relied primarily on the book of plants by Ahmad ibn Dā'ūd, known as Abū Hanīfa al-Dīnawarī. While he referred to Mu^Cjam mā Ista^Cjam of Abū ^CUbayd al-Bakrī for location of places.

It is worth mentioning that being blind, our author frequently quotes other works from memory. Thus he cites the meaning, not the actual words. That is evident in his remarks such as: I can't memorize the ḥadīth now, but its meaning is as follows,⁶ or I forgot some of the exact words in the ḥadīth.⁷ Rarely does he quote introducing his quotation with the name of a certain writer followed by "said",⁸ which gives the impression that the quotation is the actual words of the writer mentioned. The material of this type was taken mostly from al-Shaykh Abū Bahr,⁹ Abū al-Walīd al-Waqashī,¹⁰ or al-Barqī.¹¹ It is impossible to collate such material with the originals which are no longer accessible. However some citations from Yūnus's version are the exact words in the extant edition. As well as a few citations from al-Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ¹² and al-Ṭabarī's Ta'rīkh,¹³ often he follows his

1. Text, vol.1, pp.313, 381.

2. Ibid., vol.6, p.139; vol.7, p.200.

3. Ibid., vol.1, pp.247, 357.

4. Ibid., vol.2, pp.246, 431.

5. Ibid., vol.1, pp.169, 231, 248.

6. Ibid., vol.5, p.477.

7. Ibid., vol.7, p.207.

8. See e.g. ibid., p.228.

9. Cf. pp.50-51 above.

10. Ibid.

11. See pp. 49-50 above.

12. See e.g. Text, vol.2, pp.359-361. cf. Bukhārī, vol.5, pp.106-108.

13. Cf. Text, vol.1, p.192; Ta'rīkh vol.2, p.120.

quotation with this formula: "All this is from the book of..."¹ then he provides the writer's name, or "I collected and summarized this material from the books of..."²

He implies that some of his quotations, although from written sources, were not read before him. As he says occasionally qīla (i.e. it was said), or fī mā dhukira lī (i.e. from what has been mentioned to me).³ Although our author was blind he makes a few comments which can lead to questioning his blindness. For instance he stated twice that he collated with the original, the material taken by al-Shaykh Abū Bahr from the book Nasab Quraysh of al-Zubayr ibn Bakkar.⁴ He also made subtle remarks concerning the vocalization of some words. On one occasion he said, "I found this word written with a fatha in the handwriting of al-Shaykh Abū Bahr, while in the original it is written with kasra."⁵ The strongest comment in this respect is his saying: "I wrote this in my own handwriting on the authority of al-Shaykh Abū Bakr ibn al-^cArabī".⁶ As he became blind when he was seventeen years old and Abū Bakr ibn al-^cArabī died in the year 543/1149, it might well be suggested that our author was referring to what he wrote in the period prior to his blindness.

Close examination of the text of al-Rawḍ shows that al-Suhaylī sometimes confuses two different poems or repeats a verse of poetry in a different way. In the first connection, for

-
1. Text, see e.g. vol.2, p.56.
 2. Ibid., p.275; vol.5, p.245.
 3. Ibid., vol.2, pp.17, 22, 34, 39.
 4. Ibid., vol.1, p.397; vol.2, p.312.
 5. He meant the original of Abū al-Walīd al-Waqashī. See above pp.50-51. Cf. Text, vol.1, pp.325, 360, 361; vol.2, pp.55, 202; vol.4, p.94.
 6. Ibid., vol.4, p.168.

instance, he said: Hassān said in his mīmiyya, i.e. poem ends with the letter "mīm". He then produced the first hemistich which belonged to another poem which ended with the letter lām.¹ Examples of the second type are numerous. For instance he said: wa nādī jihāran, while in the extant Sīra it is fanadī nidā'an.² He also said: wa kānū mulūkan³ instead of mulūkan ^Cala al-nās⁴ and saghat⁵ instead of shā ^Cat.⁶ However it is possible that the copy of Sīra which he used contains these minor differences. The reader should recall that along with the version of Ibn Hishām our author was using Yūnus's version.

Although al-Suhaylī did not express his opinion about the qualifications of a commentator, he thinks highly of himself. This is evident in his praising of himself, his work and his treatises which occasionally he refers the reader to for more information. As for himself on one occasion, for instance, in connection with a grammar question he rebuked al-Fārisī⁷ for misrepresenting Sībawayhi's words. He then explained the problem and advised the reader to hold strongly to the explanation as according to him there were only a few scholars who understood what Sībawayhi had meant with regard to the point in question. That was also the case in other places when he referred to his treatises. In one place he said: "We dictated a comprehensive piece of work on the ḥadīth al-shu'um (i.e. bad omen), preserved in al-Muwaṭṭa'". He described it as unprecedented.⁸ Some other treatises he labeled as unique, and some as containing secrets that have never been exposed

1. Text, vol.7, p.380.

2. Ibid., p.381.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p.355.

5. Ibid., p.440.

6. Ibid., p.413.

7. Ibid., vol.7, pp.298-300.

8. Ibid., vol.5, p.122. cf. al-Muwaṭṭa', book 54.

before, while others were categorized as excellent, marvellous or even dealing with untouched points of knowledge. Once he said: "We dictated two treatises on the meaning of the eye and hand as attributed to God. These two treatises are more valuable than the whole world with whatever it contains".¹

He was also very confident of his own ability. This is shown in his criticism of Ibn Jinnī,² Ibn Qutayba,³ Abū Ubayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām,⁴ al-Bukhārī⁵ and al-Farrā'.⁶ However, he did not underestimate the ability of other scholars even those whom he criticised. Occasionally he passes a verdict in their favour, and when he admires any of their works he acknowledges it. For instance in connection with Ibn Ishāq, twice al-Suhaylī expressed himself saying: "I like his lucidity".⁷ Nevertheless that did not prevent him from pointing out his shortcomings.⁸

Although our author has used material from the commentary of al-Barqī, al-Shaykh Abū Bahr and Abū al-Walīd al-Waqashī, he described the field of sīra commentary as an untouched and unpaved way. Such a remark gives the impression that what his predecessors wrote was probably short notes, perhaps for their own use not a comprehensive commentary.

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.556. cf. vol.3, p.438; vol.4, pp.53, 259; vol.5, pp.73, 465.
 2. Ibid., vol.4, pp.157, 391.
 3. Ibid., vol.6, p.150; vol.7, p.297.
 4. Ibid., vol.6, pp.150, 381.
 5. Text, vol.6, p.565.
 6. Ibid., vol.4, p.425; vol.6, p.204. cf. p.227 below.
 7. Text, vol.5, pp.68, 69.
 8. Ibid., vol.6, pp.232, 251.

When al-Suhaylī deals with grammar, language, fiqh, theology or genealogy, he is shown to be a very accomplished scholar. But he appears to be very gullible when he deals with information concerning legends and myths, as he takes all the accounts in this connection for granted. Moreover, sometimes he endeavoured to support some of the myths which were already rejected by other scholars or to produce some of them with more details. He even added others which Ibn Ishāq omitted to mention.¹

As Ibn Hishām's work has preceded al-Suhaylī's it is necessary to compare the two works so as to put our author's work in its proper perspective.

It is notable that al-Suhaylī followed primarily the order in which Ibn Hishām presented the Sīra. Whereas Ibn Hishām's work is mainly an edition, al-Suhaylī's is mainly a commentary. Hence Ibn Hishām, for the purpose of reducing the Sīra, contented himself with adding very brief notes, confining himself almost to what Ibn Ishāq had narrated. On the contrary, our author was not satisfied with explaining and elaborating the material in the Sīra by adding long detailed accounts but also added his own speculations.²

Ibn Hishām left unexplained the verses of poetry which he cited as Shawāhid to elucidate linguistic points. Al-Suhaylī often explained these verses in his course of explaining the poetry in the Sīra; besides he pointed out obscure inflections when they occurred in such verses.³ However inflection was one of those topics that Ibn Hishām left untouched. Another such topic was fiqh. Incidentally our

1. Text, vol.4, p.250; vol.5, pp.139, 248; vol.6, p.193; vol.7, pp.157, 526, 575.

2. See for instance pp.217-18; 238-41 below.

3. Text, vol.1, pp.361, 374.

author seems particularly to be interested in these two subjects. Indeed, al-Rawḍ can be considered one of the important sources for al-Suhaylī's views on grammar as well as fiqh and language.

Ibn Hishām was a philologist of some repute, even so al-Suhaylī did not miss a chance to correct him on language or explain what the former had treated as an error. For instance in the account of the birth of the Prophet and his suckling, Ibn Ishāq said: "And he (^CAbd al-Muttalib) tried to find al-ruḍa^C ā' for him (the Prophet)". Ibn Hishām commented: It is al-marāḍi^C (i.e. foster mothers) and not al-ruḍa^C ā' (i.e. infants at the breast).¹ Al-Suhaylī pointed out that the word substituted by Ibn Hishām was right and the meaning of it was very obvious, as al-marāḍi^C is the plural of the word murḍi^C, i.e. foster mother. At the same time the word used by Ibn Ishāq was right. There were two explanations for it: The first is to read it as a muḍāf ilayhī, i.e. to suppose that dhawāt is to be mentally supplied, providing that the muḍāf was omitted. The second is to take the word literally, because when there are ruḍa^C ā' infants or babies at the breast there must needs be women to suckle them.² So Ibn Hishām was attacked on his own grounds and it was not the only time. No doubt such an explanation highlights al-Suhaylī's profound command of the language.

Although al-Suhaylī made some efforts to adhere to Ibn Hishām's principles, in omitting some accounts from the Sīra; he did not follow it blindly but only when he was convinced of the necessity of omitting such material.³ On other occasions especially poetry, he did not miss a chance to restore verses omitted by Ibn Hishām, relevant to the Sīra or not. For

1. Text, vol.2, p.144.

2. Ibid., p.163.

3. Ibid., vol.4, p.264.

instance, after producing three verses of poetry, Ibn Hishām commented saying: "It was said that these verses were found written on a rock in the Yemen".¹ Al-Suhaylī proved to be very interested in such information and he produced another two long odes which he said were found on two other rocks in Yamāma in a village called Mu^cniq. They were also described as being remains from ^cĀd. Furthermore he added some other verses belonging to the poetry quoted by Ibn Hishām. For other poetry omitted from the Sīra, al-Suhaylī used other versions as his source, mainly that of Yūnus. Although omitting unauthentic poetry was described as Ibn Hishām's greatest service to the Sīra, Some scholars blamed him for doing so, arguing that if the poetry did not belong to the Sīra, at least it belonged to a time prior to Ibn Hishām's. Therefore it could have been of great importance for those studying the poetry of that period.² However al-Suhaylī agreed with Ibn Hishām in rejecting a poem ascribed to Abū Bakr.³ Moreover he supported his view by quoting a tradition on the authority of ^cĀisha who said: "Whoever tells you that Abū Bakr uttered a single verse in Islam is telling lies".⁴

As regards genealogy, Ibn Hishām often provides it in a form of a chain whereas al-Suhaylī frequently follows the names in these chains giving information pertaining to their biographies. When there are differences of opinion between Ibn Hishām and Ibn Ishāq, al-Suhaylī refers to books of genealogy to support the opinion which he thinks is correct. He followed this method throughout his commentary not only on points of genealogy but whenever there were differences of opinion, he supported one of the two authors and often quoted proof for

1. Text, vol.2, p.12.

2. Siyar Ibn Ishāq - Zakkār, p.16.

3. Text, vol.5, p.53.

4. Ibid., p.71.

that.¹ It is valuable information for the reader of the Sīra to know which version was likely to be true.

Al-Suhaylī did not confine his commentary to the Sīra of Ibn Ishāq, he also commented on Ibn Hishām's notes. For instance the latter provided an account concerning al-A^cshā ibn Qays, the poet, he reported that al-A^cshā went to the Prophet desiring to accept Islam; when he was near Mecca or actually in it one of the heathen Quraysh met him and he told him that he was making for the Prophet to adopt Islam. Thereupon the man told him that the Prophet prohibited fornication and wine.² Al-A^cshā then decided to postpone accepting Islam for one year to have enough of wine before he committed himself.³ Apparently Ibn Hishām quoted this oral material and included it in the Sīra without a thorough investigation. Al-Suhaylī described this as negligence (ghafla) on the part of Ibn Hishām and those who followed him in repeating the same account, because it was unanimously agreed upon, that the prohibition of wine took place in Medina after the battle of Badr and Uhud had passed, and it was revealed in the chapter of Mā'ida which is one of the last of the Qur'ān to be revealed. Indicating his source as al-Ṣaḥīḥayn, al-Suhaylī further supported his view by providing another incident to prove that it was in Medina that wine was prohibited. It was an account concerning Hamza, the Prophet's uncle. It is recorded in the Ṣaḥīḥ that he became drunk, consequently he slaughtered two she-camels belonging to ^cAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib who gained them from the spoils of Badr.⁴ Al-Suhaylī then concluded: If al-A^cshā's account was genuine it must have taken place in Medina and the man who told him

1. See for instance Text, vol.5, pp.276, 292, 295.

2. Ibid., vol.3, p.370.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., vol.3, pp.379-380. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī book of Maghāzī, vol.5, pp.226-8.

thus must have been one of the hypocrites or a Jew. Another tradition to support al-Suhaylī's opinion was narrated on the authority of Jābir who said: "Some of our men took wine as a morning draught on the day of Uhud and they were killed as martyrs on the same day, before wine was prohibited".¹

Al-Suhaylī also extended the information to deal with another aspect in this tradition, the legal implication. He pointed out the opinion of jurists regarding someone who postponed accepting Islam for a certain time like al-A^Csha's decision. He commented: It is agreed unanimously that such a statement does not make him convert to Islam, unlike a Muslim who declares that he would be a nonbeliever in a certain time, such a statement expelled him from Islam immediately.²

It is such remarks of al-Suhaylī that distinguished his commentary. He does not only deal with the accounts of the Sīra with a thorough examination but also endeavours to deduce the legal implications in them.³

Al-Suhaylī's use of Yūnus's Version

It has been previously mentioned that al-Suhaylī relied primarily on Ibn Hishām's text of the Sīra, along with the version of Yūnus ibn Bukayr, which he described as authentic. The citations from Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus are numerous, so these excerpts deserve more attention, particularly as the largest part of Yūnus's version is lost.

Al-Suhaylī's quotations can be classified into four types. Firstly there is the material reported on Ibn Ishāq's authority and preserved by both writers: Yūnus and Suhaylī. This is

-
1. Ṣaḥīḥ, book of Maghāzī, vol.5, p.259.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.380.
 3. This aspect of al-Suhaylī's work forms the subject of Chapter IV below.

accessible in the extant edition of Yūnus but unfortunately it is absent from Ibn Hishām's edition. The substance of examples of such material will be given herein as it will help to acquaint the reader with the type of material that Ibn Hishām omitted or knew nothing about. Besides it will highlight for him the original text of Ibn Ishāq, since both versions were written on his authority. Secondly there is the material of which al-Suhaylī said explicitly that he quoted it from Yūnus. This is no longer accessible in the extant version due to the loss of some parts of Yūnus's text. Hence it will be appended - in Arabic - at the end of this thesis. Thirdly, there is the material which our author designated as "from Ibn Ishāq not via al-Bakkā'ī", or "Ibn Ishāq not via Ibn Hishām". Collating some passages of this type with Yūnus's text, showed that most of it is actually quoted from him.¹ Thus, probably the quotations which cannot be found in Yūnus's text belong to the lost part. Therefore this type will be appended too. But it should be noted that in one place however, al-Suhaylī made reference to both versions, i.e. Yūnus and Ibn Ishāq not via al-Bakkā'ī.² Hence not all the material designated thus, belongs to Yūnus. What is important for our study is that it highlights some accounts in the Sīra.^{there is} Fourthly, the material which was misrepresented, either by al-Suhaylī or the scribe who copied Yūnus's manuscript. In this connection comparison between the two texts is necessary, in order to elucidate the errors. This will also throw some light on al-Suhaylī's use of his sources. Besides it will help promote the assessment of some historical facts. Finally, a few examples of the material which was probably quoted from Yūnus without acknowledgement will be

-
1. See for instance; (Text, vol.6, pp.577, 578, cf. Yūnus p.264, pas.443); (Text, vol.3, p.344, cf. Yūnus, p.157, pas.219); (Text, ibid., p.320, cf. Yūnus, p.217, pas.321); (Text, vol.2, p.313, cf. Yūnus, p.92, pas.122); (Text, vol.3, p.244, cf. Yūnus, p.199, pas.286).
 2. Text, vol.4, p.203.

given too.

Regarding the first type of material, preserved by al-Suhaylī and Yūnus, though not recorded in the Sīra; we have for instance, the account concerning Zayd ibn ^CAmr ibn Nufayl, one of the four men who broke with polytheism in the era prior to the Prophet's mission, in order to seek the religion of Abraham. According to Yūnus, on the authority of Ibn Ishāq, the Prophet used to relate that, the first person to have spoken badly of idols and prohibited him from worshipping them was Zayd ibn ^CAmr ibn Nufayl.¹ The Prophet said: "While I was still a young boy I came back from al-Tā'if to Mecca accompanied by Zayd ibn Hāritha. We passed by Zayd ibn ^CAmr who had broken off with Quraysh because he had abandoned their religion. Thus he used to stay in the outskirts of Mecca. I offered him some meat and said; "O uncle eat of this meat". He said, "O my nephew I am afraid this meat is from these sacrifices which you slaughter for their idols". I answered that it was. He then said, "O my nephew if you had asked the daughters of ^CAbd al-Muṭṭalib they would have told you that I do not eat the meat of these sacrifices".² He then spoke to me about idols and those who worship them or slaughter animals to them. He said, "Worshipping idols is futile, since they can neither hurt, nor help". The Prophet then said, "Intentionally since that day I have never stroked my hands against an idol or slaughtered for it till God honoured me with his message".³ For some reasons, however, our author, who must have been well acquainted with Yūnus's version, did not like to quote him on this occasion, he preferred the authority of al-Bukhārī. Whereas the former's version seems to be primitive, the latter's is probably a late edition.⁴ Al-Suhaylī's

-
1. Yūnus, p.98, pas.133. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.5, pp.106-108. Text, vol.2, pp.347-55.
 2. Yūnus, p.98, pas.133, cf. pas.134.
 3. Ibid., p.98, pas.133.
 4. Al-Bukhārī, op. cit.

account reads thus: The Prophet met Zayd ibn ʿAmr ibn Nufayl at the bottom of (the valley) of Baldah before any Divine inspiration came to the Prophet. A meal was presented to the Prophet or the Prophet presented the meal to Zayd who refused to eat of it. He said, "I do not eat anything which you slaughter in the name of your stone idols. I eat none but those things on which God's name has been mentioned (at the time of slaughtering)¹..." It is worth noting that al-Suhaylī quoted this account exactly word by word from al-Bukhārī, but he confused in the most important part of it as he said "A meal was presented to the Prophet or the Prophet presented it to Zayd".² Probably being well aware of Yūnus's version, al-Suhaylī was avoiding a definite statement and preferred this version, as al-Bukhārī narrated that, "A meal was presented to the Prophet but he refused to eat³ from it. Then it was presented to Zayd who said..."⁴

Providing that Yūnus's version could stand criticism, it refers to an era prior to the Prophet's mission and it should not be taken as discreditable. Since in the Qur'ān God revealed, "And He found thee wandering, and He gave thee guidance"(XCIII-7). Guillaume regarded the tradition in question as evidence of the influence of a monotheist on the Prophet by way of admonition.⁵ However, the account of Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus could be questioned. He said the Prophet was still a young lad "Ghulām" and in his company was Zayd ibn Hāritha, while it is an established fact that the Prophet

-
1. Al-Bukhārī, op. cit.
 2. Text, vol.2, p.360. cf. al-Bukhārī, op. cit.
 3. Al-Bayhaqī preserved the same account on the same chain of authority, nevertheless, he did not have this piece of information. Dalā'il, pp.473-478.
 4. Al-Bukhārī, op. cit., vol.5, p.106. cf. vol.7, p.298.
 5. New Light, p.27 cf. Muhammad at Mecca, pp.162-4.

adopted Zayd after his marriage to Khadīja and possibly after the death of his two sons. At least this could shed doubts on part of this account. Moreover Ibn Ishāq mentioned no authority for it, he simply preceded it by a passive verb huddithu, i.e. "I was told".¹ Probably for this reason Ibn Hishām omitted it or perhaps because it would raise the very question that occurred to al-Suhaylī, who said, "How is it to be conceived that Zayd ibn ^cAmr ibn Nufayl was guided to abandon eating such meat in the era prior to Islam while the Prophet was more likely to have had this merit?"²

Two answers to this question were provided by our author. The first is that in the account there was no mention of the Prophet eating this meat. It merely said that Zayd refrained from eating it when it was presented to him.³ Here, al-Suhaylī seems unconsciously to be answering a question that Yunūs's version might raise, as according to al-Bukhārī, the Prophet also refused to eat.⁴ Then our author gives the second answer saying: Zayd was doing that according to his own opinion, not according to any preceding law. He went on to say that in the religion of Abraham it was only meat of dead animals which was prohibited, but not the meat of sacrifices which was prohibited later in Islam.⁵ Besides, the legal opinion is that: All things are permissible before the prohibition. Thus if the Prophet used to eat such meat, he was merely doing something which was permissible, but if he did not, then there is no obscurity. Furthermore if we hold that there was no particular law observed, in a sense that such practice was not permissible or unlawful which is more likely,⁶ it should be noted that originally, the meat of slaughtered

1. Yūnus, op. cit.

2. Text, vol.2, p.361.

3. Ibid.

4. Al-Bukhārī, op. cit., vol.5, p.106.

5. Text, vol.2, p.362.

6. See Ihkām, vol.1, p.52 seq. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, p.217.

animals like camels and sheep etc. was lawful in previous religions. Thus what they innovated later did not interfere with the permissibility of it till the coming forth of Islam and God ordained that they should not eat meat on which God's name has not been pronounced.¹ That is the reason why the slaughtered animals of the people of the book remained lawful to the Muslims and was not abolished by what they innovated. In the same way the slaughtering of the polytheists remained lawful till it was abolished by the Qur'ān.²

Another account, preserved by both al-Suhaylī and Yūnus on Ibn Ishāq's authority is that of the first mention of the Prophet in Medina. It was said that the people of Medina used to hear the Jews speaking about the apostle of God before his mission, predicting his coming forth. A woman who was called Fāṭima of Banū al-Najjār related that prior to the Prophet's mission, she used to have a familiar from the jinn (tābi^c) who would always enter upon her without permission. One day he came but he did not enter as usual. Thereupon she asked him why. He answered that a Prophet had been sent with the prohibition of adultery.³ According to Yūnus, the woman in the above quoted account was the mother of al-Nu^cmān ibn ^cAmr, the brother of Banū al-Najjār.⁴ He also described her as being a harlot. Al-Suhaylī who tends to reproduce the material with an intent upon the meaning only, said carelessly that she was the daughter of al-Nu^cmān.⁵ Probably Yūnus has the correct reading. However, Ibn Hishām must have been aware of the

1. Text, vol.2, p.362. Surat al-An^cām, verse 121.

2. Text, vol.2, pp.362-363.

3. Ibid., p.313, cf. Yūnus, p.92, pas.122, Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.167.

4. Guillaume considers this tradition to show that Jews were regarded as members of the Banū al-Najjār as al-Nu^cmān was a Jew. New Light, p.26.

5. Text, vol.2, p.313.

absurd nature of this story and he was thoroughly justified in discarding it. Moreover Ibn Ishāq provided no authority for it but himself,¹ although it belongs to the era prior to Islam.

A third example of this material is a tradition on the authority of ^CĀ'isha who related that the Prophet said, "Al-kawthar is a river in Paradise, anyone who puts his finger in his ear could hear the murmuring sound of its water".² Probably Ibn Hishām omitted this tradition as it belongs to the Prophet's sayings rather than deeds.

A fourth example of this type is the material which Ibn Ishāq preserved on the authority of the family of Sa^Cd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ. It belongs to the early period of Islam, when the Prophet, his family and his followers were boycotted by Quraysh. Sa^Cd related that, while he was with the Prophet during that period, he went out one night to relieve himself. He said, "I heard a crackle under the water, then I looked where I heard the sound. It was a piece of camel skin. I took it, washed it and then heated it. I crushed it between two stones. I then swallowed it with some water. Thus I kept myself alive for three days".³ This material probably highlights the sufferings of the Muslims during the boycott. However Ibn Hisham might not have regarded it as authentic. Because the companions of the Prophet used not to relate any sufferings or hardships they experienced in these early days, since more reward is expected when doing so.

Another example of this material is the account about Ruqayya, the daughter of the Prophet, and her husband ^CUthmān ibn ^CAffān when they emigrated to Abyssinia. Both writers narrated how the people there admired Ruqayya's beauty and

1. Yūnus, op. cit.

2. Text, vol.3, p.408; cf. Yūnus, p.253, pas.415.

3. Text, vol.3, p.354. c.f. Yūnus, p.174, pas.247.

preserved detailed accounts on that.¹ This has nothing to do with the Sīra. Similar was an account regarding the origin of Judaism in the Yemen, although it was preserved in the Sīra, al-Suhaylī added a piece of information from Yūnus's version. According to Ibn Hishām's edition, Ibn Ishāq described what happened to the temple of Ri'ām in which the people of Yemen worshipped and where they offered sacrifices and received oracles when they were polytheists. He said that the two Rabbis told Tubba^c, the king of the Yemen, that it was merely an evil spirit which deceived them in this way and they asked him to allow them to deal with it. When the king agreed they commanded a black dog to come out of the temple and killed it.² It is interesting that on the same authority, i.e. Ibn Ishāq, Yūnus preserved this account in a different way. Al-Suhaylī quoted him as saying, "After the two Rabbis were permitted to deal with what they described as an evil spirit in the temple, they started reciting the Torah. The evil spirit then came flying out of the temple and fell in the sea".³ Probably Ibn Ishāq had those two versions on this incident as Ibn Hishām was not likely to have altered the original account of the former without acknowledging it. However it seems to be a legend and like the account mentioned before it, it has nothing to do with the Sīra.

Al-Suhaylī also quoted from Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus the story of ^cUmāra ibn al-Walīd and ^cAmr ibn al-^cĀṣ, when Quraysh sent them to negotiate with the king of Abyssinia. Again what happened between the latter and the wife of the former or that of the Negus was totally irrelevant to the Sīra. However al-Suhaylī included it in his Rawd.⁴ A similar story was that of Abū Nayzar, the client of ^cAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib,

1. Text, vol.3, p.224. cf. Yūnus, p.199, pas.286.

2. Text, vol.1; p.182.

3. Ibid., vol.1, p.182. cf. Yūnus, p.32, pas.38.

4. Text, vol.3, p.253. cf. Yūnus, pp.143-150, pas.211; al-Aghānī, vol.9, pp.55-59; al-Nubalā', vol.1, p.314.

who was said to be the son of the king of Abyssinia. ^cAlī bought and freed him as a reward for what his father did for the Muslims.¹

A final example is relevant to this type of material. Although our author did not quote Yūnus by name, he seemed very conscious of what he had said: As according to Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus all the previous Prophets made the pilgrimage to the Ka^cba except Hūd and Ṣāliḥ.² Al-Suhaylī said, "Hūd and Ṣāliḥ and all their followers made the pilgrimage and that is the sound tradition".³

Although al-Suhaylī used the version of Yūnus extensively, the fourth type of material is rare. As has been previously mentioned our author was blind. Therefore he must have relied on someone to help him read the books from which he quoted and someone to write on his behalf. Thus probably most of the material which can be described as misrepresented was due to the scribe or the reader. Besides, books at the time of our author were in handwriting and mistakes might have occurred in the original copy used by al-Suhaylī.

For instance in the genealogy of the mother of Khadīja, the wife of the Prophet, al-Suhaylī quoted Yūnus on the authority of Ibn Ishāq as saying, "The mother of Fāṭima, d. of Zā'ida - Khadīja's mother - was Hāla d. of ^cAbd Manāf ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ^cAbd ibn Munqidh. Next he provided the

1. Ibid., pp.262, 263. cf. Yūnus, p.202, pas.297.

For further examples see (Text, vol.4, pp.577-578; cf. Yūnus, p.264, pas.443) (Text, vol.3, p.243, cf. Yūnus, p.201, pas.292) (Text, vol.3, p.320, cf. Yūnus, p.217, pas.321).

2. Yūnus, p.73, pas.77.

3. Text, vol.2, p.271.

genealogy back to Lu'ayy. He then said that Hala's mother was Qilāba known as al-^cAriqa - daughter of Su^cayd ibn Sa^cd, he also traced this genealogy back to ^cĀmir ibn Lu'ayy. The error occurred when he said that Qilāba's mother was Umayma daughter of ^cĀmir.¹ As the scribe seemed to have left out two lines and copied the third one, it was probably due to the fact that the ending of both lines are the same. Both ended with Huṣays ibn Ka^cb ibn Lu'ayy.² Thus three generations were left out, as according to Yūnus Umayma was the fourth great grandmother of Qilāba. She was the mother of Qayla who was the mother of Rayṭa, while the latter was the mother of ^cĀtika, who was the mother of Qilāba³ mentioned by al-Suhaylī who jumped to Umayma.⁴

Another example of this material occurred in an ode ascribed to Waraqa ibn Nawfal, which is twelve verses long as produced by Yūnus⁵ while it is eleven verses according to our author who mixed up the first hemistich of the first verse with the second hemistich of the second verse.⁶

There are also minor differences in other odes ascribed to Waraqa⁷ and ^cAbd al-Muttalib. In the latter, however, al-Suhaylī seems to have the right reading in the second verse, as according to him, "I seek refuge for him in the house with

1. Text, vol.2, p.245.

2. Ibid. cf. Yūnus, p.60, pas.58.

3. Al-Suhaylī seems to have the right reading for this name which was misrepresented in the extant edition of Yūnus as Fulāna. Yūnus, op. cit. cf. Text, vol.2, p.232.

4. Text, vol.2, p.245.

5. Yūnus, p.103, pas.142.

6. Text, vol.2, p.251.

7. Text, vol.2, p.258. cf. Yūnus, p.94, pas.126.

the pillars",¹ while in Yūnus's version it reads: "In God"² instead of "the house", which obviously does not fit. Pertaining to the same ode, in the third verse the word is "al-bunyān" according to our author whereas in the edition of Yūnus it is al-banān.³ It seems likely that the error was the fault of the scribe who copied Yūnus's manuscript. It is worth remarking that all the poetry ascribed to Waraqa and ^CAbd al-Muṭṭalib was obviously compiled in a later period, ~~in~~ Islam, which is evident from the vocabulary used. Probably for this reason Ibn Hishām omitted it.

Another type of the erroneous quotations are those accounts which al-Suhaylī designated as from Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus, while they were in fact via the latter but on another authority not Ibn Ishāq, as not all the accounts preserved by Yūnus were on Ibn Ishāq's authority. Thus probably the accounts which were described as unknown to Ibn Hisham came through this channel.⁴

For instance, concerning the account of Abū Tālib, the Prophet's uncle, al-Suhaylī commented that when the Prophet was asked whether Abū Tālib was going to benefit from his protection of him, he said, "Yes I found him in an intensive flame but transferred him to a less intensive heat". He then added that according to another tradition the Prophet said, "I hope that my intercession will benefit him so that in the Day of Resurrection he will be put in a shallow fire that reaches his ankles and makes his brain boil".⁵ That was the version recorded by al-Bukhārī.⁶ Our author then said: According to

-
1. Text, vol.2, p.157.
 2. Yūnus, p.22, pas.28.
 3. Ibid.
 4. The Life of Muḥammad, introduction xli.
 5. Text, vol.4, p.27.
 6. Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.5, p.142.

Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus, that the Prophet said, "...makes his brain boil till it runs on his feet".¹ Two mistakes were made here. First this tradition was not on Ibn Ishāq's authority. Yūnus recorded it on the authority of Sinān ibn Ismā^cīl al-Hanafī from Yazīd al-Riqāshi.² Second al-Suhaylī recorded the tradition in a way that gives an impression that this kind of punishment was associated with Abū Tālib, whereas according to Yūnus the Prophet was asked about Abū Tālib's status on the Day of Resurrection. Thereupon he replied that he will be in the shallow fire (in Hell). The people exclaimed: Does it (Hell) have shallow and deep flames? the Prophet answered it does, adding that the least status in Hell is to have a pair of shoes made of fire that make the brain boil till it runs on the feet.³ Thus the tradition did not connect this type of punishment with a particular person, as our author speculated that God's wisdom demanded the punishment to be concentrated on Abū Tālib's feet, because he chose to stand firm for the false religion of his fathers.* Al-Suhaylī knowingly adopted al-Bukhārī's version⁵ on the first part of the forementioned tradition. However Yūnus's version seems to be the original. Moreover it is earlier than that of the former.

A similar error occurred when the name of Umm Ayman was mentioned in the Sīra. Al-Suhaylī said, she was the mother of Usāma ibn Zayd and she was also called Umm al-Zibā'. Al-Wāqidī said her name was Baraka daughter of Tha^c laba and she was the maid of ^cAbd Allāh ibn ^cAbd al-Muṭṭalib, the Prophet's father.⁶ He added that the Prophet regarded her as his second mother, he used to say: "After my mother Umm

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.28.
 2. Yūnus, p.223, pas.329.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Text, vol.4, p.28.
 5. Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.5, p.142.
 6. Text, vol.6, p.577. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, p.223.

Ayman is my mother". It was also reported that he used to visit her and so did the first two caliphs. However other traditionalists hold that she was the maid of Āmina, the Prophet's mother. Our author added that Umm Ayman migrated from Mecca to Medina on a hot day. She became very thirsty, a bucket of water appeared before her and, after that, she never felt thirsty again, even if she fasted on a hot day.¹ Al-Suhaylī added that a similar story was narrated about Umm Sharīk, who became thirsty while travelling. Eventually she found water but it was with a Jew, who declined to give her any unless she too became a Jew, but she refused. In the same manner a bucket appeared before her. Al-Suhaylī added that Ibn Ishāq narrated this in a version other than that of Ibn Hishām.²

As has been mentioned, frequently he uses this phrase to refer to Yūnus's version. This story is preserved in the extant edition of the version of Yūnus³ but not on the authority of Ibn Ishāq. The editor of Yūnus's version, Ḥamīd Allāh, made a similar mistake to that of our author. He accused Ibn Hishām of omitting a very important piece of information whereas the reference was to an account which Yūnus had via other authorities, not Ibn Ishāq.⁴

A similar remark was made by al-Suhaylī when extending information on the story of the elephant and Abraha when he attempted to destroy the Ka^cba, and the punishment which God brought down on them; stones were thrown on them by birds. Whilst in Ibn Hishām's version the stones were like peas and lentils,⁵ al-Suhaylī quoted Yūnus who said, the smallest stone

1. Text, vol.6, p.577. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, p.223.

2. Text, vol.6, p.578.

3. Yūnus, p.264, pas.443.

4. Ibid., p.128, pas.192. cf. n.2.p,128.

5. Text, vol.1, p.264.

was the size of a man's head, the biggest like a camel.¹ The birds that carried the stones were like Indian men² according to Yūnus, whereas Ibn Hishām said the birds were like swallows and starlings.³ Yūnus preserved this account on the authority of Qays ibn al-Rabī^c who had it from Jābir ibn ^cAbd al-Rahmān ibn Thābit from ^cUbayd ibn ^cUmayr.⁴ Obviously it was not on Ibn Ishāq's authority.

Another account which must have been on other authorities was that of Wahshī. As it cannot be described as omitted by Ibn Hishām. Al-Suhaylī narrated on the authority of Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus that when Wahshī⁵ came to Medina the people mentioned the fact to the Prophet. Thereupon he said, "Let him alone, by God, if one man should accept Islam it is more desirable to me than killing a thousand unbelievers".⁶ Unfortunately this material seems to belong to the lost part of Yūnus's manuscript.

A final example of this was a correction of what al-Suhaylī regarded as an error. In an account concerning Mecca and its preservation, the man who came to fight ^cAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr was named in the Sīra as ^cAmr ibn al-Zubayr, the brother of the former.⁷ Al-Suhaylī pointed out that, that was an error, either on the part of Ibn Hishām or al-Bakkā'ī.

1. Yūnus, p.42, pas.43; cf. Text, vol.1, p.270.

2. Yūnus, op. cit. cf. Text, vol.1, p.271.

3. Text, vol.1, p.271.

4. Yūnus, op. cit.

5. Ibn Harb, the Abyssinian slave who killed Hamza the Prophet's uncle. He fled from Medina but later he embraced Islam and the Prophet forgave him. See Ṭabaqāt, vol.7, p.418.

6. Text, vol.5, p.461.

7. Ibid., vol.7, p.78.

He added that the true tradition was given by Yūnus ibn Bukayr on the authority of Ibn Ishāq, who named the man as ^ʿAmr ibn Sa^ʿīd ibn al-^ʿĀṣ ibn Umayya.¹ He also excused both writers saying that probably the mistake was due to the fact that ^ʿAmr ibn al-Zubayr had contracted a hostile attitude towards his brother ^ʿAbd Allāh while he was on good terms with the Umayyads, supporting them against him.² Unfortunately this account also belongs to the lost part of Yūnus's manuscript as it is not available in the existing edition. It would have been of value to know whose mistake it was, as our author himself has made a mistake here, though he might have been misguided by Yūnus. Actually the reading in the Sīra is the right one as it was ^ʿAmr ibn al-Zubayr who fought in Mecca against ^ʿAbd Allāh - his brother - and not ^ʿAmr ibn Sa^ʿīd as al-Suhaylī has corrected it. The latter, ^ʿAmr ibn Sa^ʿīd, who was then governor of Medina sent an army to Mecca under the leadership of the former, ^ʿAmr ibn al-Zubayr, after he received orders from Yazīd to despatch an army to fight ^ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr in Mecca. The whole account is preserved by Ibn Sa^ʿd³ and al-Ṭabarī,⁴ both said the incident took place in the year 60 A.H. Another scholar misled by al-Suhaylī's comment said, "Probably the fault lay with Ibn Hishām, for he was in touch with Yūnus as he says fī mā akhbaranī Yūnus".⁵ First it should be noted that Yūnus, to whom Ibn Hishām frequently refers, was Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb - the grammarian - and not Yūnus ibn Bukayr.⁶ Second, it is most probable that it was Ibn Ishāq's fault and possibly was corrected by Ibn Hishām or perhaps al-Bakkā'ī, since al-

1. Text, vol.7, p.78.

2. Ibid., p.141.

3. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, pp.185, 238.

4. Ta'rīkh, vol.5, pp.344-347.

5. Life of Muḥammad, introduction xlii, cf. 555.

6. Sīrat ibn Hishām, vol.1, pp.55, 90, 538, vol.2, p.494.

Suhayli said explicitly that he quoted what he thinks to be a correction from Yūnus, whose version seemed to reflect the original work of Ibn Ishāq more than others. Moreover Ibn Ishāq was likely to have made such an error, as still in the Sīra there is another error which was not perceived by Ibn Hishām. That was the account concerning the chapter of the cave, i.e. Sūrat al-Kahf, where he said, "This delay caused the Apostle great sorrow, until Gabriel brought him the sūra of the cave from God, in which He reproached him for his sadness, and told him the answers to the questions which they (the people of Mecca) asked; the youths, the mighty traveller and the spirit, i.e. al-rūh."¹ Actually in the sūra above mentioned there is no reference to al-rūh, but the mentioning of it comes in the sūra 17 al-Isrā', i.e. the night journey, verse 85.

Returning to our author, he followed his method of introducing characters who appear in the Sīra, adding a brief note on the biography of ^CAmr ibn Sa^Cīd. He said that he was a tyrant and a vigorous leader, to the extent that ^CAbd al-Malik ibn Marwān plotted his murder out of fear of his power over the people of Mecca.² In fact it was his power over the people of Shām that ^CAbd al-Malik feared, as it was said that they were very obedient to him,³ besides other reasons mentioned in history books.⁴

Al-Suhaylī sometimes seems to have relied entirely on Yūnus's text without referring to the text of Ibn Hishām. This is evident in the fact that al-Suhaylī several times commented on an incident or an account without realizing that

1. Text, vol.3, p.129.

2. Ibid., vol.7, p.140.

3. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.237.

4. Ṭabarī, Ta'rikh, vol.6, pp.140-46, cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.237.

it was missing from the edition of Ibn Hishām.¹ This is besides what has been mentioned earlier that on numerous occasions he referred to it as "Ibn Ishāq in a narration not via Ibn Hishām or not via al-Bakkā'ī". It would have been of great value to collate such material with the original of Yūnus, as some accounts cannot be described as omitted by Ibn Hishām. Due to the loss of Yūnus's version it is impossible to collate all the material. However the reader might recall that two other versions made on Ibn Ishāq's authority were probably available to al-Suhaylī; the version of Ibrāhīm ibn Sa^cd and that of Muḥammad ibn Salama al-Harrānī. So it is equally possible that such material was quoted from one of them or from Yūnus. What is important to our study is that it highlights some accounts in the Sīra. So a few examples will be given here.

For instance in the account concerning the Hijra of the Prophet to Medina, al-Suhaylī added an important piece of information as it throws light on the original work of Ibn Ishāq. He said, "Ibn Ishāq said (in a narration which does not come via Ibn Hishām) in a long, sound, tradition which I have shortened, that when Abū Bakr migrated with the Prophet he left his daughters behind in Mecca. When they got to Medina the Prophet sent Zayd ibn Hāritha and Abū Rāfi^c his freed man,² and Abū Bakr sent ^cAbd Allāh ibn Urayqit together with five hundred dirhams with which they bought a mount in Qudayd.³ After they arrived at Mecca, they brought

1. Cf. pp. 85 below.

2. He was presented to the Prophet by his uncle, al-^cAbbās. According to another account in the Sīra, he was still in Mecca with al-^cAbbās family at the time of the battle of Badr. Text, vol.5, pp.157, 188. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.4, pp.73-4; vol.1, p.498; Ansāb, vol.1, p.414.

3. Text, vol.4, p.203. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, p.62. According to Ibn Sa^cd's narration they bought three camels for 500 dirhams.

away Sawda daughter of Zam^c a and Fāṭima and Umm Kulthūm. ^cĀ'isha said, "My mother came out with them and Talḥa ibn ^cUbayd Allāh, travelling together; and when we were in Qudayd the camel on which my mother Umm Rūmān and I were riding, bolted and my mother began to cry "O my little daughter O my bride".¹ Al-Suhaylī then added that according to Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus, ^cĀ'isha said, "I heard a voice - but could see nobody - speaking thus: 'Release its halter'. So I did. Thereupon the camel stopped as if someone was holding him² and God saved us." She goes on to describe how they came to Medina and found the Prophet building the mosque and houses for himself. ^cĀ'isha stayed with her father while Sawda stayed in her own house. Abū Bakr asked the Prophet if he would like to consummate his marriage to ^cĀ'isha. When he said that he would if he had enough money for the dowry, Abū Bakr gave him twelve okes and twenty dirhams.² Al-Suhaylī then explained that this latter tradition from ^cĀ'isha comes via Ibn Abī al-Zinād, from Hishām ibn ^cUrwa, from his father.³ However, Ibn Sa^cd preserved the same account on the authority of al-Wāqidī from ^cĀ'isha via another chain of authority.⁵

Another example of this material was an account concerning the fight of the angels on the side of the believers on the battle of Badr. Al-Suhaylī also designated his quotation as "Ibn Ishāq not via this version". He said, The angels were in the form of men. They gave firmness to the believers by saying, "The number of your enemy is very small, and God is with you..." He also quoted that the believers used to distinguish the men they killed from those who were killed by

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.203. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, pp.62-63.
 2. Ibn Sa^cd does not have this piece of information. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, pp.62-63.
 3. Text, vol.4, p.204.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, pp.62-63.

the angels by black traces on the necks and fingertips of the latter.¹

Sometimes al-Suhaylī commented on accounts without noticing that they had been omitted by Ibn Hishām. For instance he pointed out that both Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Hishām forgot to mention those who became Muslims after they were captured at Badr. He then provided a list of their names, which he started saying, The first and the best of them was al-^CAbbās the Prophet's uncle.² He did not notice that Ibn Hishām had omitted to mention the name of al-^CAbbās with the prisoners of Badr in the first place. As the latter at the end of the list said, "We have omitted to mention the name of a man who had already been counted in the total number".³ It is noteworthy that Ibn Hishām stated explicitly that he omitted to mention the name, and he did not say the name was missing from Ibn Ishāq's list as A. Guillaume translated⁴ and speculated.⁵

Referring to our author, apparently he was using Yūnus's version, where the name of al-^CAbbās was mentioned, otherwise al-Suhaylī would have commented, at least to confirm that Ibn Ishāq did mention the name or find a reason for the omission. As another commentator, Abū Dharr, who noticed that al-^CAbbās was not mentioned, commented that he did not mention him because he had become a Muslim and was concealing his faith out of fear of his people.⁶ However this does not contradict the fact that he was taken prisoner at Badr. It was likely

1. Text, vol.5, pp.232, 241. cf. pp.212-13 below.

2. Ibid., p.352. cf. p.315.

3. Ibid., vol.5, p.315.

4. Life of Muḥammad, p.338.

5. Ibid., pp.748-749 footnote 1.

6. Sharḥ al-Sīra, vol.1, p.175. cf. Tabaqāt, vol.4, pp.73-4.

that Ibn Hishām did so in fulfilment of his principles which he stated in his introduction. Incidentally there is another account where Ibn Hishām acted in the same way but this time al-Suhaylī noticed.

Ibn Ishāq reported that while the Prophet and his Companions were building the Mosque in Medina, shortly after their migration, ^CAlī ibn Abī Tālib chanted a rajaz verse on that day:

They are not equal, one who labours night and day
To build mosques
and one who turns his face away
trying to avoid dust.¹

^CAmmār ibn Yāsir, started repeating this rajaz. When he persisted in chanting it, one of the Prophet's Companions thought it was he who was referred to. Consequently he quarrelled with ^CAmmār and threatened him that unless he stopped chanting it he would hit him.² Here Ibn Hishām added a note saying that Ibn Ishāq had actually named the man.³ Apparently Ibn Hishām preferred not to mention him. Al-Suhaylī, probably referring to the version of Yūnus, commented thus: Ibn Ishāq did name the man. He then added, but Ibn Hishām disliked mentioning him as not to mention one of the Prophet's Companions in discreditable circumstances. Therefore it can never be right to inquire after his identity.⁴ This probably explains why, had al-Suhaylī noticed the omission of al-^CAbbās's name, he would have omitted to mention him too. It also proves that al-Suhaylī sometimes uses Yūnus's version to check on Ibn Hishām's information. However another

1. Text, vol.4, p.235.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p.264.

commentator, Abū Dharr, ignored what al-Suhaylī had said and stated that Ibn Ishāq said the man was ^CUthmān ibn ^CAffān.¹

Al-Suhaylī extended the material on the fight between Abū Lahab and Abū Rāfi^C.² In the text of the Prophet's biography, Ibn Ishāq stated that when Abū Lahab struck Abū Rāfi^C violently, Umm al-Fadl, the wife of al-^CAbbās - took one of the supports of the tent and hit Abū Lahab's head.³ Al-Suhaylī provided a short biography on Umm al-Fadl. He then mentioned all her sons and finally he mentioned her daughter Umm-Habīb. Referring to her he quoted an account from the version of Yūnus, where Ibn Ishāq⁴ recorded that the Prophet saw her, i.e. Umm Habīb when she was a baby, crawling before him, and said: "If she grows up and I am still alive I will marry her". A. Guillaume quoting al-Suhaylī's words referred the pronoun 'her' to Umm al-Fadl herself, the wife of al-^CAbbās, instead of her daughter.⁵ It was merely an error on his part as the fight between Abū Lahab and Abū Rāfi^C took place during the absence of al-^CAbbās who was at the battle of Badr at that time. Secondly, the fact is that the Prophet died before she grew up. It seems extraordinary that Guillaume cited this material in the body of his translation of the text of the Sīra. That was especially so if we know that al-Suhaylī quoted Ibn Ishāq via Yūnus more than seventy times and Guillaume did not mention al-Suhaylī in the list of writers from whom some of the original of Ibn Ishāq can be recovered.

-
1. Sharḥ al-Sīra, vol.1, p.135.
 2. A mawla of the Prophet. Ṭabaqāt, vol.4, p.73.
 3. Text, vol.5, p.188.
 4. Ibid., p.189. cf. Yūnus, p.248, pas.400.
 5. Ibid. cf. Life of Muḥammad, p.311.

CHAPTER IV

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Throughout his commentary al-Suhaylī has made a genuine attempt to point out all the legal implications which can be deduced from the accounts in the Sīra. He dealt with jihād and the judgements involved in certain questions, such as the conduct of a holy war, including the withdrawal from the battlefield. He also tackled the question of the division of spoils and other questions pertaining to the main subject. The ordinance of the five obligatory prayers also, drew the attention of al-Suhaylī, as well as the establishment of Friday prayer, besides other judgements involved in some forms of prayer like praying while seated, praying over a martyr, or praying while travelling in a moving vehicle.

The question of purity, al-ṭahāra, was also tackled by al-Suhaylī. Furthermore, he investigated the significance of some forms of ritual ablution, for instance performing ablution on embracing Islam. He even investigated the origin of ritual ablution.

Al-Suhaylī also touched on other questions, such as ḥumra (lesser pilgrimage), testimony, marriage, divorce, things lawful and unlawful, some forms of business transactions, the validity of one's own legal opinion, i.e. ijtihād, the question of coercion, what is permissible to do in such circumstances and what is not, and many other questions. Moreover, al-Suhaylī has endeavoured to assess the origin of certain practices now associated with Islam.

For two reasons, however, many references will be made

throughout this chapter to Ibn al-Qayyim.¹ Firstly, it is aimed at giving a third opinion, as al-Suhaylī mostly contented himself with the views of Mālik and al-Shāfi'ī, while Ibn al-Qayyim was a Ḥanbalite. Secondly, it is to help towards the assessment of the fact that, although Ibn al-Qayyim was regarded as the first to have written a book on Fiqh al-Sīra, al-Suhaylī was certainly a pioneer in this art. It is evident that the former was merely inspired by him.

Legal questions connected with jihād

It was reported that on the day of Ḥunayn when the fighting was over, the Prophet announced that anyone who had killed an enemy could have his spoils.²

Al-Suhaylī regards this tradition as a proof of the right of the one fighting to the belongings of the one killed by him in the fight. He added: "It is his legal right whether the leader - imām - assigns it to him or not". This was al-Shāfi'ī's view,³ whereas according to Mālik the decision should be left to the commander.⁴ Mālik also recommended that such an announcement should be made when the battle was over lest the intention of jihād should be mingled with considerations of gain.⁵ In this al-Suhaylī was alluding to Mālik's opinion when he was asked whether someone who killed one of the enemy could keep the man's effects without the permission of the imām. He said, "No one can do that without the permission of the imām. Only the imām, on the basis of ijtihād, could assign it to him or not. Mālik also added that the Prophet had never been heard to say that whoever kills someone can have his

1. He was the most famous pupil of Ibn Taymiyya (d. 751/1350).

2. Text, vol.7, p.172.

3. Al-Umm, vol.4, pp.66-68.

4. Text, vol.7, p.212. cf. Muwatṭa', Book of Jihād. p.201.

5. Al-Mudawwana, vol.2, p.31.

effects, on any other day than the day of Hunayn".¹

Our author quoted another tradition recorded by Mālik, on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās, that a man asked him about booty. Ibn ʿAbbās said: "Horses are part of the booty and personal effects are as well."² Thus al-Suhaylī inferred that Mālik was of the opinion that the belongings of the slain should be included in the booty unless the imām decides to assign it to the person who did the killing.

After explaining that the jurists were of two opinions on this subject, al-Suhaylī quoted the argument of each party. Those of the latter opinion argued that ʿUmar divided the spoils taken by al-Barā' ibn Mālik when he killed the chief of al-Za'ra .³ They also relied on the verse, "And know that out of all the booty that ye may acquire (in war) a fifth share is assigned to God and to the Apostle" (VIII-41), as no exception was made here.⁴ There is also a tradition reported on the authority of ʿAwf ibn Mālik, who narrated that a man from the Himyar tribe killed an enemy and wanted to take his personal belongings. Khālīd ibn al-Walīd, who was the commander over them, forbade him. ʿAwf ibn Mālik (the narrator) - who seemed to have argued with Khālīd that it was the man's right - came to the Prophet and informed him to this effect. The Prophet asked Khālīd: "What prevented you from giving the booty to him?" Khālīd said, "I thought it was too much." Thereupon he asked him to hand it over to him. Now when Khālīd passed by ʿAwf, the latter pulled him by his cloak and said - in order to annoy him - "Hasn't the same thing happened which I reported to you from the Prophet?" When the Prophet heard him,

-
1. Muwattaʿa', Book of Jihād. cf. Mudawwana, vol.2, p.29.
 2. Text, vol.5, p.228. cf. Muwattaʿa', Book of Jihād; Tafsīr; vol.9,p.170; al-Mudawwana, vol.2, pp.29-31.
 3. Text, vol.5, p.228.
 4. Ibid.

he was angry and he said: "Khālīd don't give him anything."¹ According to Mālīk and those of his opinion, this tradition proves that the fighter has no right to the belongings of the one he has killed, otherwise the Prophet would not have stopped the payment.²

The first party of jurists rejected the tradition involving the spoils of the chief of al-Za'ra on the ground that ^CUmar himself made it an exceptional case, as he said, "You know that the effects are not to be divided, but the value of the effects taken by al-Barā' is estimated at thirty thousand. Therefore I will divide it."³ Thus they considered the tradition to support their view that the belongings of the slain should be given to the one who did the killing. Al-Suhaylī also alluded to another tradition they used as a proof: When a man called Salama ibn al-Akwa^C killed a man, the Prophet said, "Everything belonging to the man is now his".⁴

It is worth remarking that on the latter occasion the case was different, as it was reported that while the Prophet and his Companions were having a meal shortly before the battle of Hawāzin, a stranger came and began to take food with the people and look curiously around. He then left hurriedly. Ibn al-Akwa^C chased him (taking him for a spy) and killed him.⁵ So it could be understood that the Prophet gave him all his belongings as a special favour for his swift and remarkable act.

However our author did not specify his own opinion, though he seems to have held the opinion of al-Shāfi^Cī, as he

-
1. Text, vol.5, pp.228, 229. cf. Muslim, Book of Jihād, p.952.
 2. Text, vol.5, p.229.
 3. Ibid. cf. Al-Umm, vol.4, p.67.
 4. Ibid. cf. Muslim, Book of Jihād, p.953.
 5. Ibid.

regarded the tradition mentioned in the Sīra as a proof of the right of the one fighting to the belongings of the one killed by him.¹ Another scholar, Ibn al-Qayyim, discussed this point at length. He has drawn the conclusion that it is the right of the fighter to have the personal effects of the one killed by him, even if those killed by him numbered more than one. He instanced a tradition in which it was recorded that Abū Ṭalḥa, on the day of Hunayn, took the spoils of twenty men whom he killed.² He added that it was the practice of the Prophet and Abū Bakr after him. According to him, what ^CUmar did was a personal opinion based on his own ijtihād.³

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq recorded that when the Prophet decided to go to Mecca, a man called Ḥātib ibn Abī Balta^C wrote a letter to the Quraysh informing them that the Prophet intended to come against them.⁴ The Prophet knew about the letter before it reached Mecca and he got it back. He then summoned Ḥātib and asked him what had induced him to act thus. ^CUmar ibn al-Khattāb wanted to cut off Ḥātib's head.⁵ The Prophet prevented him from doing so, saying, "How do you know, ^CUmar; perhaps God looked favourably on those who fought at Badr and said, 'Do as you please for I have forgiven you'."⁶

Al-Suhaylī pointed out that Ḥātib was exempted here only on the ground that he fought at Badr. Thus the tradition was

-
1. Text, vol.7, p.211. cf. al-Risāla, pp.70, 73, Mukhtaṣar al-Muznī on the margin of al-Umm, vol.3, pp.184-186.
 2. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.196. cf. vol.3, pp.217, 218.
 3. Ibid. cf. Muslim, op. cit., vol.3, p.951.
 4. Text, vol.7, p.59.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Ibid.

a proof for the death penalty in similar circumstances.

Although ^CUmar considered Ḥatib as a hypocrite, al-Suhayli reproduced the whole tradition as the origin of capital punishment for a spy.¹ It is possible that ^CUmar based his judgement on the answer of Ḥatib. It was reported that when the Prophet asked him why he did so, he replied that he believed in God and his Apostle and had never ceased to do so, but that he was not a man of standing among the Quraysh and he had a family there and that he had to deal prudently with them for their sakes.² Thus it was possible that ^CUmar considered his actions to have contradicted his beliefs.

Mālik's opinion is that a spy should be killed, even if he is a Muslim, whereas al-Shāfi^Cī and Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal do not hold the same view. On the contrary they both agreed that if the spy is a Muslim, he should not be killed.³

As has been mentioned, our author was of the opinion of Mālik. Another scholar, Ibn al-Qayyim also supported this view, quoting Mālik's argument that if Ḥatib was spared death on the grounds of his being a Muslim, the Prophet would not have needed to mention his participation in the battle of Badr as a justification.*

* * * * *

Concerning the account on the killing of Ka^Cb ibn al-Ashraf, who composed verses of an insulting nature about the Muslim women, for which reason the Prophet asked his people

1. Text, vol.7, p.88.

2. Ibid., p.59.

3. Al-Umm, vol.4, p.166. cf. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.68.

4. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.68; vol.3, pp.215, 216.

to get rid of him¹ - al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication, saying: There is an obligation to kill whoever hurts the Prophet. As in al-Bukhārī's version of this tradition, the Prophet said: "Who will rid me of Ibn al-Ashraf for he has offended God and His Apostle".² He went on to say: Those who offend the Prophet should be killed even if they are in the protection of the Muslims (min ahl al-dhimma) contrary to the view of Abū Hanīfa who was against the killing of protected people in such matters. He also added that those who killed Ibn al-Ashraf took his head in a bag (mikhlāt) to Medina. Thus it was said to be the first head to be carried in Islam.³

Ibn al-Qayyim, also, discussed this point at length. He instanced other occasions recorded also in the Sīra, where the Prophet ordered the killing of those who offended him. He agreed with our author that the majority of Muslim jurists were of the opinion that those who insult the Prophet should be killed even if they are in the protection of the Muslims.⁴ As for a Muslim who commits the same offence, it should be regarded as apostasy. The same punishment applies to him if, when given a chance to repent he declined.⁵

* * * * *

It seems extraordinary that al-Suhaylī, who quotes ^cĀ'isha to support his views, rejects a tradition on her authority from Ibn Ishāq. After the battle of Badr was over, the Prophet ordered that the dead of Quraysh should be thrown into a pit. As they threw them in, he stood and said: "O people of the pit, have you found that what God threatened is

1. Text, vol.5, p.400.

2. Ibid., p.413. cf. Bukhārī, vol.5, pp.248-250.

3. Text, vol.5, p.413.

4. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.3, pp.213, 214.

5. Ibid.

true?" His Companions asked, "Are you speaking to dead people?" He replied that they knew that what their Lord had promised them was true." ^CĀ'isha said: people say that he said "they hear what I say to them", but what he said was "they know".¹ Our author rejected the comment of ^CĀ'isha, saying that she was not there at the time and therefore those who were there were likely to have a better recollection of what the Prophet said than she.²

Pertaining to the above-mentioned account, al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication in the tradition concerning the burial of the dead of the polytheists on the day of Badr.³ He said: The significance of the Prophet ordering the dead of Quraysh to be buried was that a dead body should always be buried, no matter to what religion he belonged.⁴ He added that that was the practice of the Prophet, who used to order the burial of any corpse he found on his way. Our author also justified the Prophet's order to his Companions to throw the dead into the pit of Badr, saying that it was easier than burying each of them separately, since they were great in number.⁵

Mālik's opinion is that there is no harm in burying two or three men in the same grave due to

-
1. Text, vol.5, p.147. A. Guillaume described this tradition as a sly attack on Mūsā ibn ^CUqba's tradition from ^CAbd Allāh ibn ^CUmar of the same meaning. Life of Muḥammad, p.305. cf. introduction xlv/5.
 2. See further Bukhārī, vol.5, p.211, where ^CĀ'isha quoted verses from the Qur'ān to support her view: "You cannot make the dead hear" (Sura XXX-52), and "You cannot make those who are in their graves, hear you" (XXXV-22).
 3. Text, vol.5, pp.146-147.
 4. Ibid., p.179. cf. al-Risāla, p.367.
 5. Text, vol.5, pp.146-147.

necessity.¹

* * * * *

On another occasion our author deduced a proof for a legal opinion that was concerning the account of Abraha, king of Yamen, who built a church with the intention of diverting the Arabs' pilgrimage to it. The Arabs heard of that and one of their chiefs was enraged. So he travelled until he came to the church and qa^cada (lit. sat)² in it, i.e. he defecated in it.

Al-Suhaylī regarded the use of the word qa^cada as a proof for the opinion of Mālik, who considered the prohibition of sitting on graves to mean: when associated with this purpose only.³ In this he was alluding to the tradition on Mālik's authority, to the effect that ^cAlī ibn Abī Tālib used to rest his head on graves and lie on them.⁴ Mālik commented: "As far as we can see, it is only forbidden to sit on graves to relieve oneself".⁵ Al-Shāfi^cī contradicted Mālik and asserted that sitting on graves is absolutely prohibited unless it be for necessity.⁶ Thus al-Suhaylī was of the opinion of Mālik.

* * * * *

As regards the account of the battle of Badr and the revelation of Sūrat al-Anfāl (VIII), al-Suhaylī discussed how the Muslims sought to conduct their wars. He then mentioned the withdrawal from the battlefield and pointed out that

-
1. Al-Muwaṭṭa', Book of Jihād, 21. p.206.
 2. Text, vol.1, p.245.
 3. Ibid., p.253.
 4. Muwaṭṭa', book of Burials, 16. p.114.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Al-Umm, vol.1, p.246.

opinions differ with regard to the explanation of the verse: "Never turn your backs on them" (VIII-15). Al-Hasan¹ considered fleeing from the battlefield as a grave sin only at the battle of Badr and at the last battle at the end of the world against the Antichrist.² However, apparently al-Hasan's opinion contradicts a tradition recorded in the Ṣaḥīḥs, that the Prophet said: "avoid the seven deadly sins". When he was asked what they were he counted as one of them, fleeing from the battlefield at the time of fighting, though he did not confine it to a particular battle.³

However, our author, after quoting al-Hasan's view, went on to say that others hold fleeing from any battle to be a grave sin except it be in a stratagem of war, or to regroup with the imām or with other troops.⁴ He then cites as an example the battle of Mu'ta⁵ when the Muslims returned to the Prophet. They said: "We are the fugitives". The Prophet said: "You are not fugitives but of those who will fight again and I am one of you".⁶ However this tradition cited by al-Suhaylī is

-
1. The illustrious scholar Abū Sa^cīd al-Hasan ibn Yasār al-Baṣrī (21/642 - 110/728), famous preacher of the Umayyad period in Baṣra. His fame rests on the sincerity and uprightness of his religious personality. Ṭabaqāt, vol.7, pp.156-178.
 2. Text, vol.5, p.235.
 3. Bukhārī, the book of Waṣāya.
 4. Text, vol.5, p.235; cf. al-Umm, vol.4, p.92; al-Muḥallā, vol.7, pp.292, 293, al-Muqaddimāt, pp.264-265. See Qur'ān (VIII-16).
 5. A place in the southern part of Syria where the Muslims fought against the combined Arab and Byzantine forces. Being vastly outnumbered, the Muslims retreated. The battle took place in the year 8 A.H.
 6. Text, vol.5, p.235.

slightly different from the version in the Sīra, as it was recorded that when the army came near Medina, the people began to throw dirt at them saying: "You fugitives, you fled in the way of God". The Apostle said, "They are not fugitives but will fight again if God wills".¹ However, our author was trying to asse^v that on that occasion the Prophet did not reproach them, a fact supported by both versions of the tradition, though from one of these versions, the Sīra, it could also be understood that the Prophet said that as a word of consolation.

Al-Suhaylī then discussed at length the circumstances in which it is obligatory not to withdraw. He said: "The Muslims were asked to tackle no more than odds of two to one against them; the one who flees from three is not to be reproached, whether his retreat was a stratagem of war or not."² He also quoted Abū al-Walīd Ibn Rushd "Averroes", who said: If the Muslims were twelve thousand in number, it is not permissible for them to flee from three times their number or more than that, as the Prophet was reported to have said: "An army of twelve thousand will never be defeated for want of numbers".³ Al-Suhaylī then cited Ibn ^cAbbās and other scholars as saying: in the beginning the command was made that one Muslim should not flee from ten. That was abrogated later by the verse: "For the Present, God hath lightened your (task), For He knoweth that there is a weak spot in you" (VIII-66).⁴

This account on the authority of Ibn ^cAbbās was reported by Ibn Ishāq with more details. It was said that when the verse, "O Prophet, exhort the believers to fight. If there are twenty steadfast ones among you they will overcome two

1. Text, vol.7, p.19.

2. Ibid., p.236.

3. Muqaddimāt, vol.1, p.264. cf. Text, vol.5, p.236.

4. Text, vol.5, p.237.

hundred, and if there are a hundred of you they will overcome a thousand unbelievers" (VIII-65). Ibn ^CAbbās said: When this verse was revealed the Muslims were disturbed and found it hard that twenty should have to fight against two hundred, and a hundred fight a thousand. So God made it easier for them and abrogated the verse and replaced it with another (VIII-66). Ibn ^CAbbās commented: when they outnumbered half of the enemy it was wrong for them to withdraw; but if they were less than half they were not bound to fight and it was permissible for them to retreat. Al-Shāfi^Cī, who quoted Ibn ^CAbbās, was of the same opinion.¹

Al-Suhaylī argued that the abrogation in the verse cited (VIII-65) is not clear, as it is divinely inspired information, khavar,² and therefore cannot be subject to abrogation. Moreover, in God's saying in the other verse "For the present, God has lightened your (task)", there is a proof that there was a rule involved in the first verse, that one Muslim should stand firm against ten, but that any obligation was being temporarily suspended. He deduced that the verse has two valid meanings; on the surface it is a khavar and a promise from God that ten Muslims will defeat a hundred of the unbelievers. The deeper meaning of it is the obligation of ten to be firm against one hundred. He quoted as a proof God's saying "Rouse the believers to the fight" (VIII-65). According

-
1. Text, vol.5, p.221. cf. al-Risāla, p.127.
 2. Al-Bāqillānī classified the khavar according to three types: khavar^C an wājib (facts), khavar^C an muḥāl (impossible) and khavar^C an mumkin (possible), which is subject to be true or false though he made an exception with regard to information inspired by God. Throughout his commentary al-Suhaylī has used the word khavar in this meaning. Tamhīd, pp.161, 162. cf. al-Mustaṣfā, vol.1, p.141.

to him the abrogation was associated with this deeper meaning, though the khavar remained a genuine promise. He added: It was fulfilled later at the time of Abū Bakr and ^CUmar in their wars against the Rūm and the Persians in Iraq and al-Shām, when a few hundred of Muslims defeated thousands of the unbelievers.¹ Ibn Hazm has a similar explanation to the verse in question.² However, al-Suhaylī's point is that the Muslims, on account of their faith, can win against odds of ten to one. That is a promise from God, provided that they are equally well or better equipped than their foe. But they were set a lighter task when their organization and equipment were weak, as was the case about the time of Badr.

Moreover, it is the opinion of the majority that the Muslims should not flee from double their number, even if the enemy is more organised and better equipped.³ While according to Ibn al-Mājishūn* there is no obligation for the Muslims to stand firm for their enemy if the latter is better equipped, and they could withdraw even if the enemy is less than double the Muslims' number. However, should it be that the Muslims are better equipped, they are obliged to stand firm against more than double their number.⁵ Obviously al-Suhaylī shared this later view, though he used the khavar argument to conclude that there was no abrogation in verse (VIII-65); only the rule was suspended for the time being. Here he differs with al-Shafi^Cī, who held the verse as abrogated.⁶

* * * * *

1. Text, vol.5, p.236.

2. Cf. al-Muḥalla, vol.7, pp.292, 293.

3. Al-Umm, vol.4, p.92.

4. ^CAbd al-^CAzīz ibn Salama al-Majishūn. He was the older fellow jurist of Mālik ibn Anas (d. 164 A.H.). Tadhkira, vol.1, p.222.

5. Muqaddimāt, vol.1, p.263.

6. Al-Risāla, p.127.

Al-Suhaylī followed the method of his book al-Ta^crīf, where he gives information about any name that occurs in the Qur'ān. In the Sīra also, he did likewise.

When Umm Hakīm, the wife of ʿIkrima ibn Abī Jahl, was mentioned, al-Suhaylī added that when her husband died, both Khālīd ibn Sa^cīd and Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān proposed to her. She preferred Khālīd to Yazīd, but the day after her marriage Khālīd was killed as a martyr in the battle of Ajnādīn.¹ When the news came to her she went out, and joined the battle. It was said that she killed seven of the Rūm.² It is worth remarking that this was not the only incident when the participation of women in the fight was reported but it was as early as the second major battle; Uhud when Umm ʿUmāra, Nusayba, daughter of Ka^cb al-Māziniyya fought in defence of the Prophet that day.³

Al-Suhaylī stated that Khālīd was killed at Ajnādāyn; al-Balādhurī, who preserved the same account, said explicitly that the battle was Marj al-Suffar,⁴ which took place twenty days after the former.⁵ Another writer agreeing with al-Balādhurī was Yūnus ibn Bukayr, though he did not preserve the account of Umm Hakīm.⁶

Our author pointed out the legal implication, saying that women have no definite share of the booty, as the Prophet allowed them only a small portion of the booty when they participated on the day of Khaybar and other battles. Thus al-Suhaylī was of the opinion of al-Shāfiʿī, who held that

1. Text, vol.7, p.142. cf. Futūḥ al-Buldān, p.162.

2. Ibid.

3. Text, vol.5, p.444.

4. Futūḥ al-Buldān, p.162.

5. Ibid., p.164.

6. Yūnūs, p.209.

women should be given a small portion of the booty if they fought.¹ Mālik stated that they should not be given anything.²

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī seems to refer to another version of the Sīra when he quotes the Prophet as saying to al-Mughīra:³ "I accept you as a Muslim but I cannot accept the money".⁴ The account in which this occurs is not in the Sīra. However it is preserved by Ibn Sa^cd and elsewhere, that before embracing Islam, al-Mughīra went to meet the governor of Egypt in the company of thirteen men of Thaqīf of Banū Mālik. It was reported that the Governor conferred his favours on the men but ignored al-Mughīra because he was only a client of theirs. Al-Mughīra became jealous and the men did not console him. While on their way back they became drunk and fell asleep; he killed them all and brought all their belongings to the Prophet and embraced Islam.⁵ This is when the Prophet said his aforementioned judgement.

Al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication in the Prophet's statement, saying: "The property of the unbelievers is unlawful for a Muslim if they felt secure with him and took him in their confidence, because that is a deceit. It is only made lawful in a state of war when you defeat them".⁶ That

1. Al-Umm, vol.4, p.85. cf. Text, vol.6, p.585.

2. Mudawwana, vol.2, p.33. cf. Muwatta', Book of Jihād, 21-6.

3. Ibn Shu^cba, was appointed by ^cUmar as governor of Basra and Kūfa (d. 50 A.H.). Ṭabaqāt, vol.6, p.20.

4. Text, vol.6, p.482.

5. Ṭabaqāt, vol.4, pp.284-286. cf. Text, vol.6, p.482; al-Mudawwana, vol.2, pp.21, 22.

6. Text, vol.6, p.482.

was the opinion of both Mālik and al-Shāfi^cī.¹

* * * * *

Another occasion when our author pointed out the legal implication was concerning the account of Ḥudaybiya. He said: It is permissible to make peace with the unbelievers without stipulating a sum of money for them to pay. This is only possible when the Muslims are in weak position.² He also pointed out that opinions differ with regard to the duration of the armistice, whether this can be more than ten years, as the Prophet on that occasion laid aside war for ten years.³ While one party's view was that it is possible if decided by the imām, another said: The armistice should not exceed ten years.⁴ They argued: The prohibition of making peace treaties with the unbelievers is the rule, and cited as a proof the verse of fighting: "And slay them wherever ye catch them" (II-191). Thus, according to them, the indulgence has only come regarding ten years and not more. This is the opinion of al-Shāfi^cī.⁵

One of the conditions in the Ḥudaybiyya armistice was that if anyone came to the Prophet without the permission of his guardians, he should return him to the unbelievers. Al-Suhaylī commented: "This has been abrogated according to Abū Ḥanifa, because when the Prophet sent Khālīd ibn al-Walīd to the tribe of Khath^cam, the Muslims therein sought refuge by prostrating. Nevertheless Khālīd killed them.

-
1. Al-Mudawwana, vol.2, p.21; al-Umm, vol.4, pp.163, 179, 196.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.483. cf. al-Umm, vol.4, p.110.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.483.
 4. Cf. al-Umm, vol.4, p.110.
 5. Text, vol.6, p.484. cf. al-Umm, vol.4, p.110, al-Risāla, p.361.

When this was brought to the notice of the Prophet, he paid half the blood money for them and said: "I have no obligation towards a Muslim living with the unbelievers".¹ Our author also pointed out that "anyone" in the forementioned condition included men and women, but a verse of the Qur'ān was revealed concerning women particularly. So the Prophet was no longer obliged to return women who chose to come to him by the verse: "...If ye ascertain that they are believers, then send them not back to the unbelievers" (LX-10).

Al-Suhaylī, however, quoted the opinion that that was an abrogation of the Sunna by the Qur'ān, but later rejected it saying: It is more suitable to say it was an exception made to a general statement than to say it was an abrogation.²

He commented on returning the Muslims to the unbelievers saying: The Prophet took it upon himself to agree to any condition Quraysh made, in which they asked him to show glorification of the sacred places.³ However in the Sīra the Prophet was reported to have said, "Today I shall agree to whatever condition Quraysh make in which they ask me to show kindness to kindred".⁴ Al-Suhaylī, relying on the account he mentioned, speculated that returning Muslims to Mecca was certainly serving the purpose of inhabiting and bringing life to the sacred house with true worshippers who pray and circumambulate it. This was a special rule, particularly for the Prophet regarding Mecca.

Legal questions connected with prayer

With regard to the account in which it was reported that

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.484. cf. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.70.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.485. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.8, p.135.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.485.
 4. Ibid., p.454.

the Prophet and his Companions on one occasion slept for so long that they missed the dawn prayer, al-Suhaylī pointed out that the tradition narrated by Ibn Ishāq on the authority of al-Zuhrī from Sa^cīd ibn al-Muṣṣayyab, to the effect that the incident took place on their way back from Khaybar,¹ is likely to be more authentic than the version which claims that it happened during the battle of Ḥunayn. But those who held that it happened in the year of al-Ḥudaybiyya agree with the first view² - as both, Khaybar and Ḥudaybiyya took place in the year 6 A.H. To support his view, al-Suhaylī alluded to another version of this tradition, on the same chain of authority, narrated by Mālik, who said the Prophet was on his way back from Khaybar.³

Al-Suhaylī also pointed out that adhān was announced and iqāma was pronounced; even so, it was a compensation for a missed prayer.*

It is surprising that, although our author mentioned that the Prophet and his Companions rode out of the valley where they slept before they prayed, he did not mention the reason why, although he proved to be very fond of such details elsewhere. According to Mālik's version, the tradition is that the Prophet ordered his Companions to ride out of the valley, saying that there was an evil spirit in it.⁵

It is worth remarking that it is on this ground that it is forbidden to pray in bathrooms and impure places, as was pointed out by Ibn al-Qayyim, who also agreed with al-

1. Text, vol.6, pp.514, 515.

2. Ibid., p.592.

3. Ibid. cf. Muwatta', Book of the times of prayer.

4. Text, vol.6, p.592.

5. Muwatta', Book 1. cf. Muslim, Book of Ṣalat, Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.147.

Suhaylī that the first tradition was likely to be more authentic, i.e. that the incident took place on the way back from Khaybar.¹

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq reported that when the unbelievers decided to crucify Khubayb ibn ^CAdī, he asked them to allow him to pray two rak^Cas, and they agreed. Thus Khubayb was the first to establish the custom of performing two rak^Cas before death.²

Al-Suhaylī commented that it became a Sunna because the Prophet approved of it. Besides prayer is the best way of concluding one's life.³

* * * * *

With regard to the account of the Ascent to heaven, Ibn Ishāq reported that a duty of fifty prayers a day was laid upon the Prophet, but on the advice of Moses, he asked God to reduce the number until they became five.⁴ Al-Suhaylī commented that opinions differ in connection with this as to whether it was an abrogation or not. One group hold that it was an abrogation of an act of worship before its being put into practice. Abū Ja^Cfar al-Nahhās⁵ denied this, as according

1. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.147.

2. Text, vol.6, p.167.

3. Ibid., p.192.

4. Ibid., vol.3, pp.444, 445.

5. Ahmed ibn Muhammad, an Egyptian scholar; he compiled three books on Qur'ānic studies: Tafsīr, I^Crāb and al-Nāsikh wa al-Mansūkh (d. 338 A.H.). See Wafayāt, vol.1, pp.35, 36.

to his principles an act of worship is not to be abrogated before being put into practice. This signifies badā', i.e. change of mind, which is impossible with regard to God.¹ Another reason is that, although according to some people an act of worship can be cancelled before being put into practice, it is impossible to cancel it before it has been sent down and reached the people.² Abū Ja^cfar said: it was a mere intercession from Muḥammad for his people, by means of which God made lighter their task, and it should not be called an abrogation.³

After explaining Abū Ja^cfar's view, al-Suhaylī then argued that it is not true that the abrogation of an act of worship before putting it into practice signifies badā'; because badā' is to act on the first opinion but later another opinion occurs and proves to be more suitable or sounder.⁴ This is impossible with regard to Him who knows everything through His eternal knowledge. Abrogation, on the other hand, is the substitution of one rule by another. But all are decreed and determined in accordance with His wisdom and eternal knowledge. Al-Suhaylī then instances the abrogation of illness by health and vice versa.⁵ Furthermore, he argued that the one who is commanded to do something has to observe three rules: The act of worship as commanded, the intention to do it, and lastly, to hold the performance of it as an incumbent duty, wājib, if it was so decreed. Thus if the command was abolished before being put into practice, two other rules remain, that is the intention and the belief in it as an ordinance. He added: God knows the intention of someone to comply with His rules; in this way He tests people and could

1. Text, vol.3, p.457.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., cf. p.52.

5. Ibid. cf. al-Tamhīd, p.146.

reward or punish in accordance with what He knows of their intentions.¹

With regard to what Abū Ja^cfar mentioned in connection with the abrogation of an act of worship after having put it into practice, al-Suhaylī argued that in such a case, it is not an abrogation either. Because the act of worship has already passed, what comes after is the prohibition of continuing it.² He then expressed his opinion saying: What we say concerning these forty-five prayers which were taken off the total for Muḥammad and his nation is: either it is an actual abrogation of a duty laid on the Prophet or a khabar. As for the abrogation, it could include the performance of the act, the intention to do it, and the belief in it as an ordinance. Moreover the conveyance of it was abrogated too. In this way it does not affect the people, as it is impossible to call it naskh with regard to them while it has not been sent down. Concerning the opinion of al-Naḥḥās that it was an intercession and not an abrogation, al-Suhaylī said: The intercession was the cause of the abrogation, not a falsifier of its actual meaning.³ As for the second possibility, our author said it could be a khabar, i.e. divinely inspired information; in this sense it was not a command of worship. As has been mentioned, this form of khabar is not subject to abrogation.* In explanation of his view al-Suhaylī added: The Prophet was told that fifty prayers had been prescribed on his umma. Probably he understood it to be literally fifty, whilst what was intended was the reward for fifty prayers prescribed in al-lawḥ al-maḥfūz (the protected tablet), not the actual practice of them.⁵ As a proof he quoted the Prophet's saying: "He of you

1. Text, vol.3, p.458. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, p.114.

2. Ibid. cf. al-Risāla, pp.122, 123.

3. Text, vol.3, p.458.

4. Ibid., p.459. cf. p.99 above

5. Text, vol.3, p.459.

who performs them in faith and trust will have the reward for fifty prayers".¹ No doubt such explanation would have raised the question: What is the significance then of reducing the number gradually in tens and finally by five? In anticipation of this question al-Suhaylī said: Not everyone remains mindful of his prayer throughout and God only accepts prayer performed mindfully. Thus maybe only half of it is accepted or a quarter or even a tenth. So, for whom a tenth of the prayer is accepted, the reward is that of five, and this number increases up to fifty with regard to those who perform it perfectly in a state of complete concentration, both when bowing and prostrating.²

However, traditions to the effect that the five prayers were very early in practice, before the ascent to heaven, are numerous. But al-Suhaylī seems to have held the view of those who regard it as being prescribed on the ascent to heaven, as he reproached Ibn Ishāq for mentioning the account of prayer earlier in the Sīra, after the first revelation of the Qur'ān.³

Pertaining to the main question, i.e. the difference between naskh and badā' and whether an act of worship can be cancelled before being put into practice or not, al-Suhaylī proved to have been well acquainted with the Ash^cariyya's views on the question, particularly the arguments of al-Bāqillāni and al-Ghazālī.⁴ In fact al-Suhaylī did not only produce al-Ghazālī's arguments but also he used some of his

1. Text, vol.3, p.444.

2. Ibid., pp.457-459. For a tradition to the same effect, see Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.1, pp.102-103; Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.1, p.213.

3. Text, vol.3, p.15.

4. Tamhīd, pp.146-147. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.114-115.

terms, such as i^ctiqād al-wujūb or al-^cazm ^cala al-adā'.¹ It should also be noted that in opposition to the Ash^cariyya, the Mu^ctazila held that it is impossible to abrogate an act of worship before its being put into practice.² Thus al-Suhaylī proved to be a thoroughgoing Ash^carite as he endeavoured to refute their arguments following his predecessors.

* * * * *

With regard to the institution of Friday prayers in Medina, Ibn Ishāq narrated that Ka^cb ibn Mālik used to call down blessings on Abū Umama As^cad ibn Zurāra whenever he heard the call to Friday prayer. When he was asked why he did that, he said it was because he was the first man to gather them to jumu^ca prayer in the hazm³ (low ground) of al-nabī^ct called naqī^c al-khaḍimāt. Al-Suhaylī extended this material saying that the gathering of the Companions of the Prophet for prayer on Friday, and the calling of that day al-jumu^ca, was by means of divine guidance before being ordained, because before that jumu^ca was called al-^carūba. Then after the migration of the Prophet to Medina the ṣūrat al-jumu^ca was revealed and Friday prayer was ordained. That explained why the Prophet said concerning Friday: The Jews and the Christians missed it but God guided you to it."

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.458. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, p.114.
 2. Cf. al-Uṣūl, pp.583-85, al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.112, 122; al-Tamhīd, pp.146-147.
 3. Al-Suhaylī quoted al-Bakrī who said hazm al-nabī^ct is a mountain one post from Medina. However Guillaume attributed this explanation to al-Suhaylī himself, cf. Life of Muhammad, p.200; Mu^cjam, p.1353. See Text, vol.4, p.100.
 4. Text, vol.4, p.100. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitāb al-Ṣalāt; Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, p.96.

He also quoted al-Kishshī¹ who related that the people of Medina gathered to pray on Friday before the arrival of the Prophet in Medina and even before it was made obligatory, and it was they who called it al-jumū^ca. The Anṣār said, "There is a day for the Jews to gather and a day for the Christians. So let us decide on a day on which to gather - remember God, pray and give thanks". They then said, "Saturday is for the Jews and Sunday for the Christians, let us make ours the day of arūba^c". So they used to call al-arūba^c al-jumū^ca.² As^c ad ibn Zurāra led them in a prayer of two rak^cas. They thus called the day al-jumū^ca because they gathered on it. So it means the day of assembly. As^c ad slaughtered a sheep for them and it was enough for both the midday and the evening meals, so few were they in number. God revealed, "When the call is proclaimed to prayer on Friday hasten earnestly to the remembrance of God" (LXII-9).³

Al-Suhaylī then commented that, although it was by divine guidance that Friday prayer was instituted by the Anṣār, it is improbable that they did it without the Prophet's permission.⁴ He then quoted a tradition on the authority of Ibn ^cAbbās to the effect that the Prophet was commanded to observe Friday prayers before his migration to Medina, but he could not gather his people in Mecca or tell them about it. So he wrote to Mus^cab ibn ^cUmayr to gather the men, women and children and to observe Friday prayer. Thus the first to observe it in Medina was Muṣ^cab ibn ^cUmayr.⁵ The commentators explained how the Jews and the Christians missed

-
1. Abū Muhammad ^cAbd ibn Humayd wrote a commentary on the Qur'ān (d. 249 A.H.). Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn, vol.1, pp.368, 369.
 2. Text, vol.4, p.101.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid.

missed it, saying: God commanded the Jews to choose a day to worship Him and they chose Saturday for themselves; and thereafter it was made obligatory. In the same manner the Christians were ordered by Jesus to choose a day and they chose Sunday.¹ However, Sunday was chosen by the Church later in commemoration of the resurrection.

Our author added that the Jews chose Saturday because they thought it was the seventh day. Moreover, they thought - out of their disbelief - that God rested on that day. The beginning of the creation, according to them, is Sunday, and Friday is the last day of the six days in which God created the universe. And that is also what the Christians believe, but they chose Sunday because according to them it was the first day of the week. But the Prophet attested that both parties had missed the day. It was also reported in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim that God created the clay on Saturday.² Hence Saturday is the first day of the beginning of the Creation; accordingly the last of the six days is Thursday, and thus narrated al-Ṭabarī on the authority of Ibn Ishāq.³ It was also narrated that al-jumu^ca was called thus because on that day God accomplished (jama^c) the creation of Adam. As has been mentioned, God guided al-Anṣār in their choice and naming of the day according to His wisdom. Al-Suhaylī added:

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.102. cf. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, pp.96-103.
 2. Abū Hurayra reported that the Prophet took hold of his hand and said: "God the Exalted and Glorious, created the clay on Saturday and He created the mountains on Sunday and He created the trees on Monday and He created the things entailing labour on Tuesday and created light on Wednesday and He caused the animals to spread on Thursday and He created Adam after ḥaṣr^c on Friday, the last creation at the last hour of the hours of Friday.
 3. Ta'rikh, vol.1, p.44.

As it was the day when God created our father Ādam and so was the beginning of the creation of mankind, and that day will also be the end, this necessitated its being a day of worship and remembrance, remembrance of the beginning and of the end. Consider God's saying "Hasten earnestly to the remembrance of God and leave off Business" (LXII-9). Hence business was mentioned particularly because it reminds us of the day when no business nor friendship will avail. Moreover, the day falls on witr, i.e. an odd number, and God likes the witr because it is one of His names (i.e. al-Wāḥid). It was by means of divine guidance that this nation was inspired to chose this day and their choice was approved of, because it met with divine wisdom. They are the last nation and for them is the precedence on the day of resurrection. And their day preceded that of the Jews and Christians. Al-Suhaylī added that the Prophet used to recite Sūrat al-Ṣajda on Friday prayer as an admonition¹ because it included the beginning of the creation (XXXII-4) and the creation of Ādam from clay² (XXXII-7).

With regard to what al-Suhaylī quoted from Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, he seemed to have ignored the view that this tradition is apparently not authentic. He himself mentioned that, according to the Jews, Christians and Muslims, God created the world in six days, while according to the tradition referred to above, God created the world in seven days.³ He was also likely to have been referring to the verse: "We created the Heavens and

-
1. The reference is to Sūra XXXII. Its theme is the mystery of creation, the mystery of time and the mystery of the Ma^cād (the final end) as viewed through the light of God's revelation; it belongs to the middle Meccan period.
 2. Text, vol.4, pp.100-104. cf. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, pp.96-
 3. See p.112, n.2, above as the creation started on Saturday and ended on Friday.

the earth and all between them in six days, Nor did any sense of weariness touch us"(L-38). When he spoke about the Jews, saying: And they thought - out of their disbelief that God rested on the seventh ~~on the seventh~~ day, as the idea behind the Muslim weekly day of assembly is different from that behind the Jewish sabbath (Saturday) or the Christian Sunday. The Jewish sabbath is primarily a commemoration of God's ending His work and resting on the seventh day.¹ However, Muslims were taught that God needs no rest, nor does he feel fatigue.²

With regard to what our author quoted from al-Ṭabarī on the authority of Ibn Ishāq, he also seemed to have ignored the fact that, only in the course of reviewing different points of view did al-Ṭabarī quote Ibn Ishāq as saying that the first day of Creation was Saturday, but later rejected it saying: Ibn Ishāq cited as a proof a tradition to the effect that God finished the Creation on Friday, the seventh day, and seated himself firmly on the throne and made that day a day of festival (^cId) for the Muslims.³ Al-Ṭabarī then commented on this saying: What Ibn Ishāq cited as a proof can also be used to prove that he is wrong, since God has said in more than one place that He created the world in six days.⁴ To emphasise this he cited the verse, "It is God who has created the Heavens and the earth, and all between them, in six days..." (XXXII-4). He also quoted another four verses (XLI-9-12), in one of which God said, "So He completed them as seven firmaments in two days" (XLI-12). After explaining that there is no contention that the two days mentioned here are included in the six days mentioned before, al-Ṭabarī concluded: As it is already known that God created the Heavens and earth in

1. Gen. 2:2; Exod. 20:11.

2. See for instance Sūra (II-255); (XXXV-35); (L-38).

3. Ta'riḫ, vol.1, p.45.

4. Ibid.

six days, besides the soundness of transmission and the multitude of narrators who reported on the authority of the Prophet that the last creation was Ādam, who was created on Friday, which is certainly to be included in the six days, otherwise there would be seven days and it would contradict the revelation. Accordingly, the first day of creation should be Sunday as the last day is Friday.¹ However, al-Suhaylī was astonished how al-Ṭabarī, with his vast knowledge, rejected the tradition recorded in the Ṣaḥīḥs on Abū Hurayra's authority to that effect, and responded vigorously to Ibn Ishāq and others who said Saturday was the first day of creation. Thus he accused al-Ṭabarī of inclining towards the opinion of the Jews by maintaining that Sunday was the first.²

Apparently al-Suhaylī contradicted himself by saying that the last day of the creation was Thursday, whilst at the same time saying that Ādam was created on Friday, unless he regarded the creation of mankind as something special. He seems to have focussed on the fact that Friday will not be witr (odd number) having in mind a tradition in which it was reported that the Prophet said: "Verily, God is witr (He is one, and it is an odd number) and He loves odd numbers".³ But our author has no authority for saying Friday is a witr.

Although al-Suhaylī quoted other scholars who endeavoured to establish that Friday prayer was instituted by the Anṣār, he stated his own opinion, saying that it is improbable that they did it without the Prophet's permission.* However, it could also be said that it was not likely that Friday was called jumu'a by the Anṣār because in the Qur'ān this day was named thus, and it is improbable that this

-
1. Ta'rīkh, vol.1, pp.45, 46.
 2. Text, vol.4, p.107.
 3. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.4, p.1409.
 4. Text, vol.4, p.101.

name was known only locally by the Anṣār while the Qur'ān was supposed to be addressing all the people; for he reported that it was called ḥarūba before the Anṣār called it jum'ā.¹

It is worth remarking that Dr. Jawād Ali discussed this point and concluded that the Arabic names of days, i.e. Sabt, Ahad, etc., were known to the people of Mecca and Medina before Islam.²

* * * * *

The institution of another prayer also drew al-Suhaylī's attention. He pointed out that the tradition recorded in the Sīra on the authority of Umm Hānī' was the origin of performing the prayer of conquest. As it was reported, Umm Hānī' related that when she came to the Prophet seeking protection for two of her brothers-in-law on the day of the conquest of Mecca, she found him washing. When he had washed he took the garment and wrapped himself in it and prayed eight rak'as. The time was before midday³ (ḍuḥa). Al-Suhaylī commented that this prayer was called ṣalāt al-fath, i.e. prayer of conquest. The leaders of armies used to perform it on conquering any town. Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was said to have performed it when he conquered al-Madā'in. Thus said al-Ṭabarī who explained how it should be performed, saying: It is eight successive rak'as without interval and without a leader, imām. Al-Suhaylī added: The reading in the prayer should be silent.⁴

However, some scholars differed from al-Ṭabarī and our

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.101. cf. Zād al-Ma'ād, vol.1, p.99.
 2. Al-Mufaṣṣal, vol.8, pp.467-470; cf. pp.464-466.
 3. Text, vol.7, p.73.
 4. Ibid., p.108. cf. Ta'rīkh, vol.4, p.16.

author's opinion concerning the way in which the prayer should be performed,¹ although they agreed upon the number of rak^cas involved, which is eight. Due to the timing of that prayer, some scholars consider it to be a duḥa (i.e. forenoon) prayer as it was recorded in Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ, being narrated on the authority of Ibn Abī Layla. No-one informed us that he saw the Prophet offering the duḥa prayer except Umm Hānī', who mentioned that the Prophet took a bath in her house on the day of the conquest (of Mecca) and then offered an eight rak^cas prayer. She added: I never saw the Prophet offering a swifter prayer than that prayer, but he was performing perfect bows and prostrations.²

Ibn al-Qayyim discussed the so-called ṣalāt al-duḥa at length, instancing numerous traditions recorded in this connection. He agreed with our author that the prayer performed by the Prophet on the day of the conquest of Mecca was ṣalāt al-fath and not ṣalāt al-duḥa as some scholars recorded it.³ He finally concluded that the Prophet did actually pray at duḥa - forenoon - but only for certain reasons did he do so, like coming back from travel. He quoted a tradition on ^cĀ'isha's authority that the Prophet never prayed at duḥa unless he came back from a journey;⁴ he added: or on conquering a town or visiting some of his Companions and praying in their houses as a blessing. Otherwise, he never performed such prayer as ^cĀ'isha said, "I never once saw the Prophet doing the voluntary prayer of duḥa,⁵ but I myself do it. Sometimes the Prophet would refrain from a practice that he loved to do fearing that people would do the same and it

1. See Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, p.94.

2. See Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.5, p.409.

3. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, p.94.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

would become obligatory for them ".¹ Thus both al-Suhaylī and Ibn al-Qayyim agreed with Mālik that the tradition recorded in the Sīra on the authority of Umm Hānī' was the origin of ṣalāt al-fath and not ṣalāt al-ḍuḥā.²

* * * * *

It was reported that the Companions of the Prophet were once extremely ill to such a degree that they decided to pray while sitting. The Prophet came out to them when they were praying thus and said, "Know that the prayer of the one who sits is only half as valuable as the prayer of the one who stands".³ Al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication in this tradition, saying that the rule applied only to those who could stand with difficulty; but for those who cannot stand at all, their prayer is as valuable - while sitting - as that of those who stand. This applied to obligatory prayers or supererogatory^{ones}.⁴ However Mālik, who preserved the same tradition, said: The Prophet came out to the people while they were praying nawāfil (supererogatory) prayers sitting down, while according to another tradition preserved by him the Prophet himself prayed sitting while he was ill. Moreover, he ordered the people praying behind him to sit down too. However the latter practice was abrogated later.⁵ Although Mālik preserved the tradition quoted above by al-Suhaylī in a slightly different way, both he and al-Shāfi'ī held that the prayer of those who cannot stand is as valuable - while

-
1. Al-Muwatta', Voluntary Prayers, p.68, cf. Zād al-Ma'ād, vol.1, p.93.
 2. For a thorough discussion see Zād al-Ma'ād, vol.1, pp.89-94.
 3. Text, vol.5, pp.27-28. cf. al-Muwatta', prayer in congregation, p.59.
 4. Text, vol.5, p.50.
 5. Al-Umm, vol.1, p.151, al-Risāla, p.254.

sitting - as that of those who stand.¹

Questions connected with ṭahāra

With regard to the account concerning ^cUmar when he embraced Islam, it was reported that his sister asked him to purify himself by washing before she could give him the sheet on which part of the Qur'ān was written. She remarked that only the clean may touch the Qur'ān.²

Al-Suhaylī commented: Although the reference in the verse, "Only the purified may touch it" (LVI-79), is to the angels, Mālik's opinion was that the rule involved applies to everyone as God associated the state of being pure with the touching of the Qur'ān.³ In this al-Suhaylī was alluding to Mālik's view in his book al-Muwatta', where he said: "No one should carry the Qur'ān by its strap, or on a cushion, unless he is pure. If it were permissible to do so, it would also have been permissible to carry it in its cover. This is not because there is something on the hands of the one who carries it by which the Qur'ān will be soiled, but because it is disapproved of for someone to carry the Qur'ān without being pure out of respect for the Qur'ān, and in order to honour it".⁴ He quoted as a proof the verse previously cited by al-Suhaylī, besides another verse, "No, it is a reminder, and whoever wishes will remember it. Upon honoured pages, exalted and purified, by the hands of scribes, noble and obedient"⁵ (LXXX-14).

However, our author did not agree completely with Mālik

-
1. Al-Mudawwana, vol.1, pp.76-79. cf. al-Umm, vol.1, p.69; al-Risāla, pp.254, 255.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.267.
 3. Ibid., p.273.
 4. Muwatta', Book of the Qur'ān, 15, p.101.
 5. Ibid.

in this connection. He categorized the verdict involved as mandūb (recommended but not obligatory). He added that the import of the letter that the Prophet sent to ^CAmr ibn Ḥazm to the effect that none should touch the Qur'ān unless he was pure, was a recommendation too, although it sounds like an obligation. He supported his view by quoting as a proof the Prophet's letter to Caesar inviting him to embrace Islam, as the letter included part of the Qur'ān (verse 64 of sura III).¹

According to our author a number of Muslim scholars were of the same opinion, i.e. the permissibility of touching the Qur'ān when not in wuḍū', using the Prophet's letter to Caesar as a proof and rejecting the tradition involving the letter to ^CAmr ibn Ḥazm, on the ground that the latter tradition was classified as mursal,² therefore it cannot stand as a proof. Al-Suhaylī probably had in mind the arguments of Ibn Ḥazm, who rejected Mālik's view.³ He then examined the verse which Mālik used as a proof and concluded that from the standpoint of language the verse is obviously referring to the angels, as the word al-muṭahharūn, i.e. the pure, was used and not al-mutaṭahhirūn, i.e. those who purify themselves. He goes on to say that there is a great difference between the two words since angels are naturally pure, while men use a purifier to keep themselves clean, likewise women. He quoted as a proof for his latter remark the verse, "But when they

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.274.
 2. Mursal is a tradition in which a successor quotes the Prophet directly. cf. footnote 3 al-Muḥallā, vol.1, pp.81-82. By most of the traditionists, mursal ḥadīth was counted as mawqūf because no one knew whether the reporter, who was omitted, was a reliable authority or not. See al-Mustasfā, vol.1, p.169.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.274. cf. al-Muḥallā, vol.1, pp.82-84.

have purified themselves you may approach them" (II-222); whereas the wives of the faithful in the hereafter are described as pure: "Therein shall they have companions pure and holy" (IV-57).¹ Obviously al-Suhaylī was of the opinion of al-Shāfi'ī and the majority, who held it permissible to touch the Qur'ān when not in a state of wuḍū'.²

Our author then proceeded to give his opinion as regards the Prophet himself in this respect. He said: "In my view the Prophet belongs to both those who purify themselves and those who are pure. To the former he belongs because he was a human being who has to cleanse himself by washing from major ritual impurity (janāba) and by ablution from minor ritual impurity. To the latter he belongs because of the opening and washing of his chest and heart and their filling ~~with~~ both faith and wisdom".³

* * * * *

Concerning the woman of Banū Ghifār whom the Prophet took on the back of his saddle while she was a young girl, Ibn Ishāq related that she said, "When the Apostle dismounted for morning prayer and I got off the back of his saddle, to my surprise some of my blood was on it. It was the first time that this had happened to me. I clung to the camel in my shame. When the Apostle saw my distress and the blood he guessed the reason and told me to cleanse myself, then to take water and put some salt in it, and then to wash the back of the saddle".⁴

Unexpectedly al-Suhaylī contradicted Mālik's opinion, as

-
1. Text, vol.3, pp.274, 275.
 2. Ibid., p.274, cf. al-Umm, vol.1, p.44.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.276.
 4. Ibid., vol.6, p.516.

he regarded this tradition as a demonstration against those jurists who alleged¹ - to use his own expression - that water is no longer a purifier after salt is added to it, though they argued in such a case that the water itself is pure.² He argued: theoretically the water should take the rule involved in the additive provided that it changes its colour, taste or smell. Thus if the additive is regarded as pure but not a purifier, then so should the water be. But if it was neither pure nor a purifier, like urine for instance, thus should be the water. In this instance, when the additive is regarded as pure and at the same time a purifier like sand and salt, the same rule should be applied to the water. Hence it is pointless to say water is not a purifier if salt is added.³

Al-Suhaylī then added a piece of information indicating his source as the version of Yūnus; he said it was reported that the Prophet washed on the day of the conquest (of Mecca) from a container that contained water and camphor.⁴ He explained his opinion concerning this tradition saying: If the report was authentic, it should be understood that the Prophet meant to use that water as a perfume and he was not in a state of impurity. Nevertheless, Abū Ḥanīfa considered it as a proof for the permissibility of using such water.⁵

However, regarding the first question, the whole argument arises unnecessarily, as the Prophet ~~only~~ asked the girl in question to cleanse the saddle. Moreover, there is a tradition recorded by Mālik on the authority of Abū Hurayra who related: A man came to the Prophet and said, "Messenger of

1. Text, vol.6, p.573.

2. Ibid. cf. al-Mudawwana, vol.1, p.4; al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, pp.53, 56-57.

3. Text, vol.6, p.573.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid. cf. al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, p.53.

God! we travel by sea and we do not carry much fresh water with us, so if we do wuḍu' with it we go thirsty. Can we do wuḍu' with sea water?" The Prophet replied: "Its water is pure, and its dead creatures are ḥalāl, lawful".¹ This tradition is unanimously regarded as sound. Thus if sea water is suitable for making wuḍu', salty water of necessity follows. However, according to Mālik this tradition was only a proof for using sea water as a purifier, otherwise water should be used as a purifier only when nothing is added to it to change its colour, taste or smell, regardless of the additive itself, whether it is pure or not.² Al-Shāfi^cī regarded water as a purifier even if its colour, taste or smell was changed, provided that nothing impure was added and the water is two measures (i.e. five waterskins full) or less.³ If the water is more than two measures it should be regarded as a purifier provided that nothing changes its colour, taste or smell.⁴ Thus al-Suhaylī agreed more with al-Shāfi^cī on this question and rejected Malik's opinion. Though it could be inferred from his argument that he does not pay heed to the colour of the water, its taste or smell as long as the additive itself is a purifier. However, al-Suhaylī argues theoretically, while al-Shāfi^cī argues in view of the traditions.⁵

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq reported on the authority of a man he described as one whom he did not suspect - that the Prophet

-
1. Al-Muwaṭṭa', Book of purity.
 2. Ibid. cf. al-Mudawwana, vol.1, p.4; al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, pp.53, 56-57.
 3. Al-Umm, vol.1, pp.10, 11. cf. al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, p.53; al-Muḥalla, vol.1, pp.199-201.
 4. Al-Umm, vol.1, pp.10, 11. cf. al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, p.53.
 5. Al-Umm, vol.1, pp.8-13.

prayed over Hamza and all those martyrs who were killed at Uhud.¹ Al-Suhaylī explained that this account was not regarded as trustworthy by the jurists for two reasons. First, the authorities were regarded as weak, since it was said that when Ibn Ishāq says "whom I do not suspect", he always means al-Hasan ibn ^CUmara² who was considered as a weak transmitter by all the traditionists. But if it was not that man whom Ibn Ishāq meant, then the tradition would not be accepted either, as the authorities were unknown. Second: it is a tradition that was never accompanied by a deed as it was nowhere reported that any of the caliphs prayed over a martyr, except those who were left wounded at the battlefield and died afterwards. Besides, it is the only version where it is said that the Prophet prayed over a martyr.³ He added that the martyrs should not be washed in the fulfilment of the word of God, "Think not of those who are slain in God's way as dead" (Sura III-169). He added that there is another reason not to wash a martyr, as his blood is the result of an act of worship (jihād). He then quoted a tradition that the Prophet said on the day of Uhud: "that a martyr comes on the Day of Rising, blood will gush forth from his wound. It will be the colour of blood, but its scent will be that of musk".⁴ The same opinion about the prayer over a martyr was recorded on the authority of Mālik who said that he had heard the people of knowledge say that martyrs in the way of God were not washed, nor were any of them prayed over.

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.21.
 2. A Kufan traditionist (d. 153 A.H.). He reported on the authority of al-Zuhri and ^CAmr ibn Dinār. Shu^Cba made a comment to the effect that he regarded quoting him as a deadly sin. Al-Majruhin, vol.1, p.229; Du^Cafā, p.30.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.43. cf. Ansāb, vol.1, p.336.
 4. Text, vol.6, p.44.

They were buried in the garments in which they were slain.¹ However, it was reported that ^CUmar ibn al-Khattāb was washed and shrouded and prayed over, yet he was a martyr. Al-Suhaylī seems to have maintained the view of both Mālik and al-Shāfi^Cī, who held that someone who is carried off (i.e. from the battlefield) and lives for as long as God wills after it, is washed and prayed over as was ^CUmar ibn al-Khattāb.² Thus they confined the first verdict to those who are killed on the battleground and are not reached until they are already dead.

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī also pointed out the legal implication in the account of Hanzala ibn Abī ^CĀmir (al-ghasīl), the washed one. It was reported that when he was killed the Prophet said: "Your companion is being washed by the angels". When they asked his wife about his condition, she said that he had gone out to battle when he heard the cry while in a state of ritual impurity.³ Al-Suhaylī commented, saying: This is interesting for the jurists who are in favour of washing a martyr if he was in a state of ritual impurity. He further added that some jurists do not hold that view, because death abrogates legal summons.⁴ This latter view seemed to be more sound. Moreover it is difficult to know whether a martyr was in a state of ritual impurity or not. However, al-Suhaylī did not indicate his own opinion as regards this question.

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq reported that when Usayd ibn Hudayr

-
1. Al-Muwatta' , Book of Jihād, p.203.
 2. Ibid., p.204. cf. al-Umm, vol.1, p.237.
 3. Text, vol.5, p.437.
 4. Ibid., p.464.

wanted to embrace Islam he asked Muṣ^cab ibn ^cUmayr what to do, on entering the religion. Thereupon the latter told him that he must wash and purify himself and his garments, then bear witness to the truth and pray.¹

Al-Suhaylī commented on this point saying: this is applicable to anyone who wants to embrace Islam. He added: opinions differ concerning the intention in which he does the wash. Some scholars hold that the wash is to purify himself from major ritual impurity, janāba.² Whereas another group hold that in this case the above underlined concept is not applicable as Islam abrogates whatever happened prior to it.³ According to this latter group the wash should be taken with an intention to start worship, as the wash is a preliminary step to being able to pray and the unbelievers do not pray, though prayers are prescribed for them, but prayer had to be preceded by faith. Thus if the first step which is faith is not conditioned, it is more than likely that the second step, i.e. washing from major ritual impurity, is not conditioned too.⁴ He clarified his opinion, saying that the wash should be undertaken with an intention to worship.⁵

Our author found it most extraordinary that some scholars regarded it as a question of preference. He was referring to al-Tirmidhī who said, regarding the wash on embracing Islam, "It is preferable to make it".⁶ He also reproached those who considered it as a mere Sunna, not obligatory, saying: this is not clear, as God revealed in the Qur'ān, "Truly the pagans are impure" (IX-28), and washing

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.76.
 2. Ibid., p.110. cf. al-Mudawwana, vol.1, p.36.
 3. Text, vol.4, p.110.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid., p.111.
 6. Ibid.

is the only way to abrogate impurity. According to al-Suhaylī impurity here is not associated with being in a state of ritual impurity, but with being an unbeliever. Hence, as the wash from major ritual impurity abrogates the wash from the minor impurity, similarly the belief purifies from the unbelief and abrogates the need to wash from janāba, as disbelief is the major impurity here.¹

Al-Suhaylī was of the opinion of the majority that ghuṣl is obligatory on embracing Islam;² nevertheless he contradicted a fellow jurist of Mālik, Ibn al-Qāsim,³ who seems to have been of the opinion that another ghuṣl should be taken with an intention of purifying from janāba.⁴

* * * * *

It was related by Ibn Ishāq that when fever attacked the Prophet's Companions in Medina, he said, "O God, make Medina as dear to us as Mecca and even dearer and bless its food, and carry its fever to Mahya^ca".⁵ Both Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Hishām left such material unexplained, while a reader of the Sīra may wonder why the Prophet said this. Al-Suhaylī clarified this, saying: the Prophet described fever as a means

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.111.
 2. Al-Mudawwana, vol.1, p.36. Cf. Sunan vol.1, p.148.
 3. Abū ^cAbd Allāh, ^cAbd al-Rahmān; he accompanied Mālik for twenty years and wrote al-Mudawwana on his authority. Al-Mudawwana, vol.6, pp.470-471.
 4. Ibid., vol.1, p.36.
 5. Text, vol.5, p.27. Mahya^ca is al-Juhfa. It was once a large village on the road from Medina to Mecca about four stages distant from the latter. Mu^cjam, vol.1, pp.36.16; vol.2, pp.368-69.

of purification (ṭahūr) that cleanses the faithful, and it is their share of hell-fire.¹ Thus he prayed for his Companions but at the same time he wanted those who suffer from it to be patient so as to be rewarded. However, there are other traditions with the same meaning, and others contradicting it. For instance, the Prophet prevented his people from cursing themselves, their children, their servants or their possessions, for fear that it might agree with an hour of answering. Those who relied more on this tradition held the first tradition to be in conflict with the character of the Prophet.

* * * * *

Al-Suhayli proceeded to investigate the origin of the word janāba (major ritual impurity). It was reported that after the defeat at Badr Abū Sufyān swore that he would not practise wash from janāba until he had raided Muḥammad.³ Al-Suhaylī commented that this tradition supported the fact that the wash (ghuṣl) from janāba was not something introduced in Islam. It was like hajj (pilgrimage). They both survived from the religion of Ibrāhīm and Ismā^cīl. He went on to explain why it was called janāba, saying: it was because people should keep far from the sacred house when they were in that state.⁴ Thus the derivation of the word according to him is from the word ajnab and janiba (to be far). Thus

1. Text, vol.5, p.48.

2. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.4, p.1370. Cf. Text, vol.5, p.49. Abū Hurayra narrated that the Prophet said: "There is a time in the day of Jumu^ca when God gives to a Muslim standing in prayer whatever he asks for". See al-Muwaṭṭa', book 5.

3. Text, vol.5, p.389.

4. Ibid., p.405.

al-Suhaylī has given us a reason which goes back to pre-Islamic times, whereas Lisān al-^cArab specifically associates the word with Islam.¹ Moreover al-Suhaylī quoted the verse, "If ye are in a state of ceremonial impurity, bathe your whole body" (V-7), to emphasise what he said. According to him, the command was very general because the people addressed were well acquainted with the meaning, unlike the verse on ablution (waḡū') (V-7), where there are many details because the people addressed were not familiar with it. Thus an explanation was given of how to perform it and under which circumstances.²

Legal questions connected with marriage and divorce

Concerning the raid of Banū al-Muṣṭaliq, it was reported that the Prophet took many captives. One of those taken was Juwayriyya, daughter of al-Hārith ibn Dirār, their chief. It was also reported that she was a most beautiful woman. She came to the Prophet asking for his help. ^cĀ'isha said: "As soon as I saw her at the door of my room I took a dislike to her, for I knew that he would see her as I saw her".³

First, al-Suhaylī pointed out that this tradition revealed how ^cĀ'isha was a jealous wife; it also showed her understanding of the Prophet's personality and what effect beauty had on him. He instanced another occasion to that effect.⁴ Our author also seems to have had a question in mind, that is, how the Prophet's looking at Juwayriyya could be justified. As God said, "Say to the believing men that they should lower their gaze..." (XXIV-30), and the Prophet was

-
1. Ibn Manẓūr, vol.1, p.270.
 2. Text, vol.5, p.405.
 3. Ibid., vol.6, pp.405, 406.
 4. Ibid., p.433.

the leader of the pious and their example.¹ He quoted the opinion of his teacher saying: I heard (Shaykhunā) Abū Bakr ibn al-^cArabī saying that either he looked upon her because she was a slave girl, or because he wanted to marry her. He added that it could also have been because the observance of seclusion, i.e. ḥijāb, was not prescribed at that time.²

Al-Suhaylī drew the reader's attention to two facts: that looking upon slave girls is not prohibited, and looking at a woman whom one intends to marry is permissible as well. He referred to another occasion when a woman came to the Prophet and entrusted herself to him. It was reported that the Prophet saw her and cast a glance over her from head to foot.³ He alluded to another tradition on the authority of Abū Hurayra, who related that he was in the company of the Prophet when there came a man who informed him that he had contracted to marry a woman of the Ansār. Thereupon the Prophet said: Did you cast a glance over her? When he answered negatively the Prophet commanded him to do so. Al-Suhaylī added that the Prophet advised some of his Companions to do so also, namely, al-Mughīra and Muḥammad ibn Maslama.⁴ Besides, he referred to a chapter in al-Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ devoted to the permissibility of looking upon a woman whom one intends to marry. In that chapter al-Bukhārī narrated on the authority of ^cĀ'isha who said, "The Prophet said to me: You were shown to me twice in (my dream). A man was carrying you in a silken piece of cloth and he said to me, "She is your wife, so uncover her", and it was you. Afterwards I remarked to myself; "If this is from God then it ought to happen". Our author described this tradition as a

1. Text, vol.6, p.433.

2. Ibid., p.434.

3. Ibid., p.433. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitāb al-Nikāh, vol.2, p.717.

4. Ibid.

good proof for what he had said earlier,¹ although he questioned the latter statement of the Prophet saying: The Prophet's vision is a revelation, so why did he doubt it? He suggested an answer saying that the Prophet did not doubt the reality of the dream itself, but he doubted its interpretation as dreams could be interpreted literally or figuratively.²

With regard to the main question that al-Suhaylī discussed, it is worth noting that al-Wāqidī preserved another version of the Prophet's marriage to Juwayriyya which does not mention the Prophet's looking upon her.³ However, if the account in the Sīra is authentic, the Prophet is more than likely to have looked at her spontaneously, as it is evident from both versions, Ibn Ishāq's and al-Wāqidī's, that she entered suddenly upon the Prophet and ^CĀ'isha. None of them knew who she was until she herself told them who she was and what she wanted.⁴ Though it is obvious that this question was first raised by al-Suhaylī's teacher.

* * * * *

Another marriage of the Prophet drew al-Suhaylī's attention. That was his marriage to Ṣafiyya. It was mentioned that after she was taken as a captive, the Prophet manumitted her and considered her manumission as her dowry, therefore he did not give her any dowry.⁵

Al-Suhaylī remarked that this tradition is sound and most Muslim scholars hold it as valid, but those who do not hold the same view confined the verdict involved in it

1. Text, vol.6, p.434.

2. Ibid.

3. Al-Maghāzī, vol.1, p.412.

4. Ibid., p.411. cf. Text, vol.6, p.405.

5. Text, vol.6, p.564.

to the Prophet, i.e. paying no dowry on marrying a woman, while other regarded it as an abrogated verdict. Our author stated Mālik's opinion saying, "Mālik was of the opinion that manumission cannot replace a dowry".¹ Apparently al-Suhaylī does not subscribe to Malik's view.

However in considering the Qur'ān, the validity of Mālik's opinion is likely to be substantiated by the verse, "And give women (on marriage) their dowries as a free gift; but if they, on their own good pleasure, remit any part of it to you, take it and enjoy it with right good cheer" (IV-4). It is obvious from this verse that women are not recommended to remit their dowries altogether but only part of it, if they wish to do so. Similarly there is another verse, "Give them their dowries as prescribed" (IV-24). A minimum dowry is prescribed but it is not necessary to stick to the minimum; every man is recommended to give according to his means.² The verses quoted above make it difficult to believe that the Prophet did not pay a dowry on one of his own marriages, unless the price for Ṣafīyya's freedom was assigned before the manumission and she accepted it as a dowry.

However, confining the verdict to the Prophet has an implied reference to the following verse, "And a believing woman if she entrust herself to the Prophet, if the Prophet decides to marry her (it is) especially for thee, not for the believers" (XXXIII-50). It made it permissible for the Prophet to marry a woman if she so desired without paying any dowry; even so, the Prophet married Maymūna and paid her dowry without any demand on her part.³ It could also be suggested that probably the Prophet considered Ṣafīyya's manumission

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.564. cf. al-Mudawwana, vol.2, p.223; al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, pp.356, 357.
 2. Cf. al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, pp.356-357.
 3. Cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Book of Nikāḥ, vol.2, p.717.

as her dowry because she so desired. However, al-Suhaylī did not state his own opinion explicitly though he held the tradition as sound. Thus he might have been of the opinion of the majority that manumission can stand for dowry.¹ Ibn al-Qayyim as a Ḥabalite was of this opinion too.²

Al-Suhaylī recorded an interesting account on the authority of Ṣafīyya to the effect that the Prophet apologized to her for what he did to her people.³ Although the tradition was quoted from the version of Yūnus, unfortunately it is not available in the extant edition.

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī also tackled other legal questions pertaining to marriage. For instance, in an account concerning the Prophet's son-in-law, Abū al-^cĀṣ ibn al-Rabī^c, and his acceptance of Islam, Ibn Ishāq reported on the authority of Dā'ūd ibn al-Ḥuṣayn from ^cIkrima from Ibn ^cAbbās, that the Prophet restored Zaynab, his daughter, to her husband - after six years had passed - according to the first marriage without a new procedure i.e. marriage contract.⁴

Our author commented: Although this tradition is more authentic than the other version on the authority of ^cAmr ibn Shu^cayb, who reported from his father, from his grandfather, that the Prophet restored Zaynab to her husband according to a new procedure,⁵ none of the jurists put it into practice as it contradicts the verse, "If ye ascertain that they are believers, then send them not back to the unbelievers. They are

1. See al-Tirmidhī, vol.2, p.291.

2. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, p.28. cf. vol.4, pp.28, 29.

3. Text, vol.6, p.562.

4. Ibid., vol.5, p.169, cf. Ansab, vol.1, p.399.

5. Ibid., p.200. cf. al-Tirmidhī, vol.2, pp.305, 306.

not lawful (wives) for the unbelievers, nor are the (unbelievers) lawful (husbands) for them" (LX-10).¹

Al-Suhaylī also made an attempt to explain away the tradition on the authority of Ibn Ishāq saying: ‘ala al-nikāh al-awwal, i.e. according to the first marriage, should be understood, ‘ala mithl al-nikāh al-awwal, like the first marriage in the dower and marriage gift, the Prophet did not introduce any new condition in the new contract of marriage.² Thus al-Suhaylī used a lexicographical method to reconcile the tradition in the Sīra and that which was adopted by the jurists.

Ibn al-Qayyim discussed this question at length; he pointed out that the tradition in the Sīra, to the effect that the Prophet restored Zaynab to her husband without a new procedure, is authentic.³ According to him that incident took place before the revelation of the verse (i.e. LX-10) by means of which that practice was abolished; as the verse was revealed after the armistice of Ḥudaybiyya while Zaynab's husband accepted Islam shortly before that.⁴

Pertaining to the same question, al-Suhaylī pointed out that there is a proof text for al-Shāfi‘ī who did not differentiate between a man becoming a Muslim before his wife or vice versa.⁵ According to him the verdict is that they should not be separated, provided that all had taken place while the woman was in her period of ‘idda, i.e. a prescribed period of three months. The proof is in the account of Abū Sufyān and his becoming a Muslim before his wife;

1. Text, vol.5, p.200.

2. Ibid.

3. Zād al-Ma‘ād, vol.4, p.14.

4. Ibid.

5. Text, vol.7, p.94. cf. al-Umm, vol.4, p.185.

nevertheless, the Prophet did not separate them until his wife had become a Muslim before her ḥidda was over and he settled with her by the first marriage.¹ A similar account was reported of Ḥakīm ibn Hizām as well.² Al-Suhaylī then alluded to Mālik's opinion, saying that he did not hold the verdict involved in the two cases to be the same,³ as according to Mālik, if a man becomes a Muslim before his wife, a separation occurs between them if, when he presents Islam to her, she does not accept it. He quoted as a proof the verse, "Do not hold fast to the ties of women who are unbelievers" (LX-10).⁴ But if a woman became a Muslim before her husband and she did not make the hijra, she should not be separated, provided that her husband became a Muslim before her period of ḥidda was over. He quoted as a proof the account concerning Ṣafwān ibn Umayya. It was reported that on the day of the conquest of Mecca his wife became a Muslim, while he did not. The Prophet gave him a respite for four months and he did not separate him from his wife till he embraced Islam.⁵ Mālik also reported that between the acceptance by Ṣafwān of Islam and that of his wife, there was about one month.⁶

With regard to women who make the hijra, Mālik said, "We have not heard about any woman making the hijra for God and His messenger while her husband was an unbeliever abiding in the land of unbelievers, but that her hijra separated her and her husband unless her husband came in hijra before her period of ḥidda had been completed."⁷

-
1. Text, vol.7, p.94. cf. vol.5, p.135.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid., vol.7, p.94. cf. al-Muwatta', Book of marriage, p.253.
 4. Al-Muwatta', Book of marriage, p.253.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Ibid.

Ibn al-Qayyim discussed this point as well. Firstly, he pointed out that the observance of ḥidda has neither textual proof support nor was consensus recorded in connection with it, as it is nowhere recorded that the Prophet ever asked any woman, when restoring her to her husband, whether her ḥidda had passed or not.¹ Secondly, he concluded that what could be understood from all the traditions recorded on the Prophet's practice in this instance, is that once a man or a woman becomes a Muslim before his or her partner, their contract of marriage is to be regarded as suspended. If a Muslim woman completes her ḥidda while her husband is still an unbeliever she has two options; either to remarry or to wait for her husband as long as she wants. If he becomes a Muslim their marriage becomes valid without any new procedure. He added that, as far as we know, no one has ever renewed his contract of marriage because of Islam.² He instanced the account of Ṣafwān and that of Abū Sufyān, drawing the conclusion that although these two incidents and others took place after the revelation of the verse (LX-10), the Prophet did not make a new procedure.³ Hence the validity of ḥidda according to him is only for the benefit of a Muslim woman if she decides to remarry because ḥidda is not applicable to a non Muslim woman.

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq, after quoting two verses of poetry in which the word mudhammam was used instead of Muhammad, made a statement to the effect that Quraysh had called the Prophet mudhammam to revile him. The Prophet used to say, "Aren't you surprised at the injuries of Quraysh which God deflects from me? They curse and satirize mudhammam (blameworthy reprobate) whereas I am Muḥammad (the laudable,

1. Zād al-Maḥād, vol.4, p.14.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p.15.

4. Ibid.

praiseworthy)".¹

Al-Suhaylī commented on this saying: Al-Nasā'ī, using this tradition as evidence for the need to use exact words, argues that whoever divorces his wife with words which are not likely to give the meaning of divorce, his divorce is not valid. Our author described this as a good inference.² However according to Mālik, strong statements expressing the same idea, for instance "I cut myself off from you" or "You are abandoned", were considered as three pronouncements of divorce for a woman whose marriage had been consummated.³ According to the majority, divorce is always valid with whatever statement pronounced, as long as this was the intention.⁴

Legal questions connected with hijra

Al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication in the account of the migration to Abyssinia,⁵ saying: in circumstances of religious persecution, abandoning one's homeland is recommended, even if the homeland be Mecca - with all its merits - and the place of refuge non-Islamic. An example is the case of the emigration to Abyssinia which was a Christian country. He went on to say: whenever falsehood prevails and overwhelms truth and the righteous people are oppressed and persecuted, the rule is valid, that is, to emigrate to any other country where one can practice one's religion freely and worship God openly. In this sense the hijra is perpetual and will never cease till the Day of Resurrection. He quoted the verse, "To God belong the east and

1. Text, vol.3, p.287.

2. Ibid., p.313, cf. al-Nāsā'ī, vol.6, pp.129-130.

3. Al-Muwatṭa', Book of divorce, 29-2.

4. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.4, pp.79-81.

5. Text, vol.3, p.203. cf. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.1, pp.24-25.

the west: ~~Whether~~soever ye turn, there is the presence of God, for God is All pervading, All-knowing" (II-15).

Al-Suhaylī then extended the information to deal with the emigrants themselves, saying that they were the people who prayed to the two qiblas, i.e. Jerusalem and Ka^cba, and combined the two hijras. In their connection God revealed, "The forerunners (of Islam) the first of those who foresook (their homes) and of those who gave them aid, and (also) those who follow them in all good deeds, well-pleased is God with them, as are they with Him" (IX-100).¹ However, this verse is not confined to those who emigrated to Abyssinia. The reference is more likely to be to those who emigrated to Medina, because of the mentioning of al-Anṣār along with the emigrants. Nevertheless the former could be included, as the verse was revealed concerning the forerunners from both parties, i.e. the emigrants and the Anṣār.² Al-Ṭabarī preserved two different opinions with regard to this verse: according to ^cĀmir and al-Sha^cbī the forerunners were those who paid the willing homage bay^c at al-rudwān; whilst Abū Mūsā al-Ash^carī, Sa^cīd ibn al-Musayyab and others held that the forerunners were those who prayed to the two qiblas.³ Apparently our author, in confining the verse to those who emigrated to Abyssinia, seems to have adopted the latter view; certainly all of them could be included along with others.

Another legal question al-Suhaylī points out in this account concerns the way that people ought to pray if they are travelling by ship. It was reported in the Sīra that Ja^cfar ibn Abī Ṭālib asked the Prophet this. He said pray while standing unless you fear sinking. Al-Suhaylī hinted that the authenticity of this tradition is questionable. Whilst it occurred in the

1. Text, vol.3, pp.255, 256.

2. Ibn Kathīr, vol.2, p.284.

3. Tafsīr, vol.11, pp.6-9. cf. Ibn Kathīr, vol.2, p.384.

Musnad of Abū Shayba that Anas prayed while sitting, al-Bukhārī reported al-Hasan's opinion that one should pray while standing unless one is afraid of harming other people.¹

* * * * *

On the account of the persecution of the early Muslims², al-Suhaylī commented that they were tortured and exposed to the burning heat of the Meccan sun while wearing coats of mail. Many gave way under the pressure of persecution, except Bilāl, who resisted them.³ God revealed concerning them: whosoever, after accepting faith in God, utters unbelief, Except under compulsion, his heart remaining firm in faith" (XVI-106). For his part, al-Suhaylī added that another verse was revealed concerning ^CAmmār ibn Yāsir and his father: "... except by way of precaution, that ye may guard yourselves from them" (III-28). On the other hand others maintained that the first verse refers to ^CAmmar.⁴ Our author then discussed this question at length, "In order to feel safe, it is permissible for the believer, if compelled and in fear of his life, to say anything with his tongue, since the heart is the seat of faith". He instances Ibn Mas^Cūd, who was reported to have said: "I would say any word capable of deflecting two lashes from me". That is with regard to utterances.⁵ As for deeds, opinions differ, though there is no contention regarding the permissibility of drinking wine if one is afraid of being killed. However, if one fears something less than being killed, then endurance is preferable. But if in not drinking, one fears nothing more than a day in prison or a little abuse, that in itself does not justify a sin (ma^Cṣiya).⁶

1. Text, vol.3, p.261.

2. Ibid., pp.199, 200.

3. Ibid., p.218.

4. Ibid. cf. Ibn Kathīr, vol.2, p.588.

5. Text, vol.3, p.218.

6. Ibid. cf. al-Rāzi, vol.5, p.355.

There is also no contention with regard to the prohibition of killing under any circumstances. As one is permitted anything less than killing in order to deflect by means of that the killing of a believer, i.e. oneself, therefore if one were to deflect death from oneself onto someone else, then there would be no indulgence in such a case.¹

Jurists differed with regard to compulsion in cases of adultery. It was reported on the authority of Ibn al-Majishūn² that he said: there can be no indulgence in this instance, because one would not be capable of doing it except out of one's own will and desire, and actions motivated by one's own will are not permissible as compulsion.³ Al-Suhaylī also gives another opinion for which no source is indicated, that on the contrary it becomes permissible under fear of death because touching can trigger off desire in the same way as the chewing of food triggers off the production of saliva.⁴ He added that eating unlawful food will also be permissible under the circumstances of coercion.⁵ However, the latter opinion concerning adultery is a view of the Zāhirites.⁶ Al-Suhaylī did not indicate whether he agreed with it or not.

* * * * *

-
1. Ibid., p.219. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, p.314, al-Uṣūl, p.145.
 2. ^cAbd al-^cAziz ibn Salama al-Majishūn. He was the older fellow jurist of Mālik ibn Anas with whom the latter shared leadership in Medina. It was said that he was the first to compile a legal work. He died in 164 A.H. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.222, Ta'riḫ Baghdād, vol.10, p.436.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.219. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.356.
 4. Text, vol.3, p.219.
 5. Ibid. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.356.
 6. Al-Muḥallā, vol.8, p.331.

Pertaining to his earlier remarks concerning the permissibility of appearing to confess to unbelief whilst under compulsion,¹ al-Suhaylī, on another occasion, added that it is not proper for a believer to tell an outright lie or appear to confess to unbelief even under compulsion if there is any chance at all of avoiding it. He adduced as an example of this the Negus position when a charge of apostasy was brought against him by his own people. According to the account in the Sīra,² before going out to meet his people, he wrote on a piece of paper these words: "He testifies that there is no God but Allāh and that Muhammad is His slave and Apostle; and he testifies that Jesus, son of Mary, is His slave, His Apostle, His spirit and His word, which He cast into Mary". Then he put it in his gown near the right shoulder and went out to his people. In the course of discussion he asked his people their opinion about Jesus. When they said that Jesus was the son of God, the Negus, placing his hand over the hidden paper, said: "I bear witness that Jesus is none other than this".³ In that way he avoided telling an outright lie; at the same time his people were satisfied. To support his view that such practice cannot be called lying, al-Suhaylī quoted a tradition on the authority of the Prophet who said: "The person who says a good word in an attempt to reconcile two parties cannot be called a liar",⁴ and the example given is a case of two men between whom there is estrangement and you tell one of them that you heard the other praying for him whilst in fact you heard the latter praying for all the Muslims. This is justifiable as the former is one of the Muslims.⁵ Obviously al-Suhaylī was well aware of the view of the Ash^cariyya who permitted telling a lie under certain circumstances, while according to the Mu^ctazila, telling an

1. Text, vol.3, p.218; see above.

2. Ibid., pp.251, 252.

3. Ibid., p.252.

4. Ibid., p.261. cf. al-Tirmidhī, vol.4, p.331; al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.356.

5. Text, vol.3, p.252. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.356.

outright lie was not permissible even under the threat of death.¹

Legal questions connected with ^Cumra

With regard to the fulfilled pilgrimage (^Cumrat al-qaḍā'), al-Suhaylī pointed out that it is also called ^Cumrat al-qiṣāṣ i.e. (requital) ^Cumra which is more suitable according to him, as God in its concern said, "The sacred month for the sacred month, and for all things prohibited there is the law of requital" (II-194).² He added: it was called ^Cumrat al-qaḍā', not because the Prophet fulfilled - qaḍa - the first one when Quraysh prevented him from performing it, but because he sued - qāḍa - them for it, as the first ^Cumra was not invalidated by their action. Hence it has always been counted as one of the ^Cumras of the Prophet.³ Al-Shāfi'ī was of the same opinion with regard to the meaning of qaḍā' in this context.⁴ Referring to al-Suhaylī he discussed the number of ^Cumras performed by the Prophet and their times. He said: They were four, al-ḥudaybiyya, al-jī'irāna, al-qaḍā', and finally the one which he performed with the farewell pilgrimage, as he did that ḥajj as qārīn, i.e. combining ḥajj and ^Cumra. Concerning the time, our author said, according to a tradition on 'Ā'isha's authority, one of the Prophet's ^Cumras was in Shawwāl, whereas according to most versions all his ^Cumras were performed in Dhū al-Qa^Cda, except the one which he joined with ḥajj; that was the opinion of al-Zuhrī.⁵

-
1. Al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.356; vol.2, p.429. cf. al-Iqtisād, p.112; al-Mustasfa, vol.1, pp.56-58.
 2. Text, vol.7, p.25.
 3. Ibid. cf. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol. , p.172. cf. al-Bukhārī, vol.3, pp.3-4.
 4. Al-Umm, vol.2, p.136.
 5. Text, vol.7, p.26.

However, Mālik did not ascribe the tradition quoted above to ^CĀ'isha. He recorded it on the authority of Hishām ibn ^CUrwa from his father;¹ while Abū Dā'ūd, on the same chain of authorities, ascribed it to ^CĀ'isha. On the other hand, al-Bukhārī recorded on the authority of the latter, Ibn ^CAbbās and Anas that the Prophet only performed ^Cumra in dhu al-qa^Cda.²

Our author extended the information to deal with the Prophet's pilgrimage. He said: According to al-Tirmidhī, he performed hajj three times; twice while in Mecca before the hijra and then the farewell pilgrimage.³ Al-Suhaylī objected to this, saying: In fact none should be ascribed to him but the latter. However, if what al-Tirmidhī said was sound, it should be explained that in that hajj, the Prophet was not following the correct way of making hajj.⁴ Besides it was not in its proper time as the Prophet at the time was under the power of the polytheists. He added that it was because the hajj was transferred from its proper time that the Prophet did not perform it from Medina after the conquest of Mecca; as it was reported that the Prophet did actually intend to make hajj on his way back from Tabūk shortly after the conquest of Mecca, but when he remembered that the pagans still went round the Ka^Cba naked, he waited until he denounced their treaties to them in the ninth year A.H. He then performed hajj in the year 10 after the disappearance of all practices associated with paganism.⁵

Al-Suhaylī then proceeded to give the jurists' opinion with regard to the verdict involved in performing ^Cumra. He

1. Al-Muwatta', Kitāb al-Ḥajj. 20, p.164.

2. Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.3, pp.2-3.

3. Text, vol.7, p.26.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.27.

said: according to Ibn ^CUmar , Ibn ^CAbbās and most of the jurists, ^Cumra is incumbent,¹ whereas according to al-Sha^Cbī it is not. It was reported that he used to read the verse, "And complete the ḥajj and ^Cumrata for God" (II-196), as "And complete the ḥajj and ^Cumratu is for God". By reading the word ^Cumra in the nominative case it was no longer joined to the word ḥajj.² Thus the command according to al-Sha^Cbī is regarding pilgrimage, but ^Cumra is a voluntary act.

Our author then alluded to Mālik's opinion with regard to the numbers of ^Cumra allowed, saying that Mālik, who held it as a sunna, dislikes performing ^Cumra more than once a year;³ while Ali, Ibn ^CAbbās, ^CĀ'isha and al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad held that one could do ^Cumra several times in the year.⁴ Al-Shāfi^Cī was of this latter opinion.⁵

Ibn al-Qayyim discussed at length these questions tackled by al-Suhaylī. He agreed with him on the first point, the meaning of ^Cumrat al-qadā'. He also agreed on the number of the Prophet's ^Cumras and their times, and supported the opinion of Ibn ^CAbbās and others that one is allowed to perform ^Cumra as many times as he wishes in the year.⁶

However it should be clarified that, while most of the scholars held that ^Cumra is incumbent, al-Ṭabarī explained what is obligatory in this connection, saying: What is incumbent according to verse II-196 is the completion of ^Cumra,

1. Text, vol.7, p.27; al-Umm, vol.2, pp.113-114; cf. p.48.

2. Text, vol.7, p.27. cf. al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, (II-196), vol.2, p.207.

3. Text, vol.7, p.27. cf. al-Muwatṭa', Kitāb al-Ḥajj, p.166. al-Muqaddimāt, vol.1, p.304.

4. Text, vol.7, p.27. cf. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.1, p.174.

5. Al-Umm, vol.2, p.115; cf. p.48.

6. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.1, pp.171-177.

having once been undertaken. He added that it is in the same category as a voluntary hajj, which is obviously not obligatory, but once it has been undertaken it is obligatory to complete its rites.¹ He ascribed this opinion to Ibn ^CAbbās and ^CAbd Allāh ibn Mas^Cūd.²

Legal questions connected with things lawful and unlawful

Al-Suhaylī tackled other questions, for instance things lawful and unlawful, particularly those whose prohibition was disputed. It is reported in the Sīra that on the day of Khaybar the Prophet prohibited eating the flesh of domestic asses.³ It is also reported on the authority of Jābir ibn ^CAbd Allāh that when the Prophet did that, he gave indulgence to his Companions with regard to eating horseflesh.⁴ Ibn Ishāq remarked that Jābir was not present at Khaybar.⁵

Al-Suhaylī commented saying, with regard to the flesh of domestic donkeys, it is unanimously agreed upon its prohibition. He rectified this, saying although there is a tradition on Ibn ^CAbbās's and ^CĀ'isha's authority to the effect that it is lawful.⁶ They used as a proof the verse, "Say I find not in the message revealed to me any (meat) forbidden to be eaten by one who wishes to eat it, unless it be dead meat, or blood poured forth, or the flesh of swine, for it is an abomination, or what is impious (meat) on which a name has been invoked other than God's" (VI-145). They also quoted a tradition to that effect; A man came to the Prophet asking him about the permissibility of eating the flesh of domestic

1. Al-Tabarī, op. cit., pp.211, 212.

2. Ibid.

3. Text, vol.6, p.503.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., p.551, cf. Sharḥ al-Tirmidhī, vol.7, p.293.

donkeys. Thereupon the Prophet replied: "Feed your family of the best ones you have".¹ In another narration there is an interesting addition, the Prophet was reported to have added, "What I forbade is the eating of the flesh of donkeys wandering in the exterior of the village".²

Al-Suhaylī, who was in favour of the prohibition, endeavoured to refute Ibn ʿAbbās's argument. Concerning the verse quoted above, he classified it as Meccan and added that the prohibition took place at Khaybar; according to him it was an explanation for the verse and an abrogation of the permissibility of eating the flesh of domestic donkeys.³ As for the tradition he classified it as weak. He went on to say: If it is authentic there are two ways to explain it; either the man in question was in severe hardship, so the Prophet permitted him to do so, or that happened before the prohibition was laid.⁴

Apparently al-Suhaylī, in passing his first remark with regard to the verse, was influenced by al-Ghazalī's views of naskh, as the latter held that sunna can abrogate the Qur'ān and vice versa, against al-Shāfiʿī who denied this type of naskh.⁵ In fact al-Ghazalī instanced the prohibition of eating the flesh of domestic donkeys as a proof.⁶ However, our author's second explanation for the tradition is not acceptable, as in the second version it was stated clearly that it happened after the prohibition was laid down, as the Prophet said "What

1. Text, vol.6, pp.551-553.

2. Ibid., p.553.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. cf. Sharḥ al-Tirmidhī, Vol.7, pp.295-96.

5. Al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.114, 115.

6. Ibid., p.120. cf. al-Risāla, pp.106-113, see p.159 below

I forbade..."¹

Probably this second version of the tradition, i.e. in which the Prophet was reported to have said, "What I prohibited is ...", is the key for the cause of the prohibition on the day of Khaybar as, according to many traditions recorded in Muslim and elsewhere that the donkeys slaughtered on that day were found wandering in the exterior of the village, this also explains why the Prophet described their flesh as loathsome or impure because they eat dirt.² It is also reported that the Prophet prohibited the flesh and milk of jallāla, i.e. camel wandering about and eating dirt.³

Although al-Suhaylī was well acquainted with Mālik's opinion and argument concerning this point, he did not adopt it as a response to those who were of the opinion of its permissibility. Instead he adopted the tradition recorded in the Sīra as a proof and quoted Mālik's opinion to emphasise it. Probably he did that intentionally, because Mālik held both donkey and horse flesh to be prohibited, while our author was in favour of the permissibility of horse flesh, following al-Shāfi'ī's opinion;⁴ even so, he admired Mālik's argument. He said: Mālik deduced an excellent proof from the Qur'ān when he said that horses, mules and donkeys were not eaten because God had said, "And He hath created horses, mules and asses, for you to ride, and as an adornment" (XVI-8). On the other hand, when God mentioned cattle He said, "And cattle He hath created for you, from them ye derive warmth, and numerous

1. See above.

2. Cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitāb al-Ṣayd, vol.3, p.1073.

3. Text, vol.6, p.554. cf. al-Tirmidhī, vol.3, p.175, al-Musnad, vol.12, p.7039; Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.5, p.373.

4. Al-Umm, vol.2, p.223.

benefits and of their meat ye eat" (XVI-5).¹ Thus according to Mālik God associated horses, mules and donkeys with riding and adornment, but cattle with warmth, food and other benefits.²

Pertaining to the permissibility of eating horse flesh, our author provided another tradition to support the one already narrated on Jābir's authority; Asmā', daughter of Abū Bakr, related that they had slaughtered a horse and eaten it during the lifetime of the Prophet.³ He pointed out that there is a difference of opinion amongst the jurists as to whether the eating of the flesh of the horse is lawful or unlawful. Al-Shāfi'ī takes it to be quite lawful, as it has been stated in the above-mentioned tradition.⁴ Mālik treats it as something abominable. He inferred his proof from the Qur'ān, as quoted above.⁵ Besides, there is a tradition transmitted on the authority of Khālīd ibn al-Walīd, that the Prophet prohibited the eating of the flesh of the horse, the domestic ass and the mule.⁶

Ibn al-Qayyim seemed to have been well aware of al-Suhaylī's argument concerning the prohibition of domestic donkeys. He said: the verse, i.e. (VI-145), quoted above, made only four categories unlawful; however, it is well known that prohibition and permissibility of things gradually was revealed to the Prophet. Thus the prohibition of the flesh of domestic asses is prescribed independently, as the verse does not mention anything in this connection. It does not cancel a

-
1. Text, vol.6, pp.553, 554. cf. al-Muwatṭa', Book of game, 25.
 2. Text, vol.6, pp.553-4; Iḥkām, vol.2, pp.24-5.
 3. See . Muslim, op. cit., Bukhārī, Book of hunting.
 4. Text, vol.6, p.553; cf. al-Umm, vol.2, p.223.
 5. Text, vol.6, p.454.
 6. Ibid. Muslim, op. cit.

permissibility laid down by the Qur'ān or particularise something, let alone to say it is an abrogation.¹

However, such animals were used for riding and for commercial purposes. The Prophet was encouraging people to own horses particularly, therefore he did not prescribe zakāt on them - furthermore he increased the share of the booty of those who own horses. Thus it is not likely that he permitted people to eat the flesh of horses, while prohibiting domestic asses. As has been mentioned, for certain reasons on the day of Khaybar the Prophet did that. Even so, the eating of such meat was due to necessity: necessity raised by the condition of the animal itself or that of the people.

* * * * *

In the tradition on the prohibition of domestic asses, al-Suhaylī seized the opportunity to correct an error which occurred in it when related by Mālik. He reported, on the authority of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri, that the Prophet forbade temporary marriage with women and the flesh of domestic donkeys on the day of Khaybar.²

Al-Suhaylī pointed out that it is unknown to the biographers or traditionists that the prohibition of temporary marriage took place on the day of Khaybar. He referred to another version of this tradition on the same authority, where it was said: (lit.) that the Prophet forbade the flesh of domestic asses on the day of Khaybar, and temporary marriage.³ According to our author this does not demand that

1. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.142.

2. Text, vol.6, p.557. cf. al-Muwatta', Book of Marriage, 28, p.253.

3. Text, vol.6, p.557. cf. al-Musnad, vol.2, pp.812, 592, 1203; cf. al-Bukhārī, vol.7, p.311.

that the prohibition of temporary marriage also took place on the day of Khaybar, but it could be later.¹ He described the first tradition recorded by Mālik as being misrepresented by Ibn Shihāb saying that the error cannot be attributed to Mālik, since some other scholars who narrated the tradition on Ibn Shihāb's authority maintained the same error.²

Our author then gave a brief summary concerning the difference of opinion regarding the time of the prohibition of temporary marriage. He said; the most extraordinary version apart from the version on al-Hasan's authority, who said that it happened at the fulfilled pilgrimage, is that the prohibition took place at the raid of Tabūk.³ The most famous and authentic version is that narrated by al-Rabī^C ibn Sabra on the authority of his father, who said it happened in the year of the conquest (of Mecca).⁴ Our author was alluding here to the tradition which was reported by Muslim; al-Rabī^C ibn Sabra reported that his father went on an expedition with the Prophet during the victory of Mecca, and they stayed there for fifteen days, and the Prophet permitted them to contract temporary marriages with women. Al-Rabī^C's father said: So I and another person of my tribe went out, and I was more handsome than he, whereas he was almost ugly. Each one of us had a cloak, my cloak was worn out, whereas the cloak of my fellow was quite new. As we reached the lower part of the upper side of Mecca, we came across a young woman like a young, smart, long-necked she-camel. We said, is it possible that one of us may contract temporary marriage with you? She said: What will you give me as a dowry? Each one of us spread his cloak. She began to cast a glance on both persons. My companion also looked at her when she was casting a

1. Text, vol.6, p.557.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid. cf. Muslim, Kitāb al-Nikāh, vol.2, pp.706-7.

glance at her side and he said: This cloak of his is worn out, whereas my cloak is quite new. She, however, said twice or thrice: There is no harm in (accepting) this cloak (the old one). So I contracted temporary marriage with her, and I did not come out (of this) until the Prophet declared it forbidden.¹ Al-Suhaylī pointed out that those who said the prohibition took place on the raid of Awtās agreed with this account.²

Although al-Suhaylī discussed the time of the prohibition, he left the question of the prohibition itself untouched. Another scholar, Ibn al-Qayyim discussed both questions. He agreed with our author that the prohibition took place in the year of the conquest and not at Khaybar as held by some scholars. He also explained that ^CAlī used to mention the prohibition of both; domestic asses and temporary marriage together, as a response to Ibn ^CAbbās who gave some relaxation in connection with both practices.³

As for the prohibition itself, he quoted different opinions, and concluded that the most authentic narration is that, in the year of the conquest, some relaxation was made concerning it and then it was prohibited for all times to come. He then quoted the first opinion of Ibn ^CAbbās that the Prophet did not prohibit temporary marriage as a permanent command; instead he prohibited it when there was no need for it and permitted it under the stress of necessity.⁴ He added that when people understood his opinion wrongly saying that he was in favour of the permissibility, Ibn ^CAbbās abandoned this opinion, and laid emphasis on the prohibition.⁵

1. Text, vol.6, p.557. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.707.

2. Text, vol.6, p.559.

3. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.142. cf. al-Musnad, vol.2, 812, 592, 1203.

4. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.142.

5. Ibid., p.143.

Considering the above-quoted tradition on the authority of al-Rabī^C from his father, it is very evident that temporary marriage is not a practice introduced by Islam, but rather one of the old customs belonging to the era prior to Islam. The reader might have already noticed that when the two men proposed to the woman mentioned in the tradition, in order to contract with her mut^Ca, i.e. temporary marriage, she did not ask them what mut^Ca marriage was. Instead she immediately asked them what they would give her as a dowry. This showed clearly the background of this practice, which can be defined as a marriage contracted for a fixed period on payment of a stipulated sum to the woman. According to the same tradition, some relaxation was made under the stress of necessity. As the narration said, they stayed there for fifteen days and the Prophet permitted them to contract temporary marriage. According to a contemporary scholar,¹ the Muslims had long been separated from their wives, and at the same time all of them had not, by that time, learnt the habit of complete sex control. They were thus hard pressed and the Prophet permitted them some concession in the spirit in which a person who is driven by extreme hunger is allowed to eat carrion, blood, and the flesh of swine.² Apparently this subscribes to the first opinion of Ibn ^CAbbās, although the latter abandoned it and this scholar was not in favour of treating mut^Ca marriage as coming within the same category as the prohibition of the flesh of swine.³

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq reported that after the conquest of Mecca, Abū Bakr brought his father, Abū Quḥāfa, to see the Prophet, after he accepted Islam. When he entered, the Prophet noticed

-
1. ^CAbd al-Hamīd Siddīqī, the editor of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim.
 2. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.709, n.1848.
 3. Ibid.

that Abū Quhāfa's hair was very white. He told him to dye it.¹

Al-Suhaylī commented, saying that it was not an obligation, wājib; it was just recommended to do so, mandūb, as it was narrated in a sound tradition that the Prophet himself did not dye his hair.² He rectified this saying; although there is another tradition on the authority of Abū Hurayra to the effect that the Prophet did dye his hair. Those who try to combine the two traditions say that it was only some few white hairs whose colour he used to change by using scent. Al-Suhaylī then quoted a tradition from al-Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ, narrated on the authority of ʿUthmān ibn Mawhab, that Umm Salama, the Prophet's wife, showed him some of the Prophet's hair which was red.³ Our author, who adopted a method of reconciling contradictory traditions, said that if it was said, this would be an indication that the Prophet used to dye his hair, whereas in the sound tradition, on the authority of Anas, it was recorded that he did not; the answer is that when the Prophet died they had some of his hair dyed so as to preserve it.⁴

Our author then added an interesting note. He said that some other versions of this tradition, recorded by Ibn Ishāq, added to it, "Let him avoid black dye".⁵ He went on to say that, on the grounds of this tradition, the majority of Muslim scholars do not approve of using black dye.⁶ Nevertheless it was recorded that ʿUmar ibn al-Khattāb said, "Use black dye

1. Text, vol.7, p.67.

2. Ibid., p.95.

3. Ibid. cf. Shamā'il, p.29; al-Bukhārī, vol.4, p.487; Dalā'il, vol.1, pp.183-84.

4. Text, vol.7, p.96. cf. Shamā'il, p.25 seq.

5. Text, vol.7, p.96, cf. Dalā'il, vol.1, pp.183-84.

6. Text, vol.7, p.97, cf. al-Muwaṭṭa', Book of hair, p.464.

as it is more intimidating to the enemy and desirable to women".¹ He quoted the opinion of Ibn Battāl who explained this tradition, saying; black is recommended for young men but undesirable for the aged.²

It is worth remarking that al-Suhaylī did not quote Mālik's opinion in this connection. The latter recorded a tradition to the effect that ^CĀ'isha sent her slave girl to ^CAbd al-Rahmān ibn al-Aswad. She swore that his hair would be dyed and informed him that Abū Bakr used to dye his hair. Mālik commented that there is no clear indication in this ḥadīth that the Prophet did dye his hair. Had he dyed his hair, ^CĀ'isha would have sent a message to that effect to ^CAbd al-Rahmān ibn al-Aswad.³ He then stated his opinion about dying the hair black saying; "I have not heard anything certain on that, and other colours than that are preferable to me".⁴

Ibn al-Qayyim discussed this point and concluded that black dye is only prohibited when an aged woman uses it in order to look younger and deceive men or vice versa.⁵ Otherwise it is not prohibited at all, as it was reported that Ḥasan and Ḥusayn used to dye their hair black.⁶ Moreover, Ibn al-Qayyim supported the tradition in which it was recorded that the Prophet did dye his hair, quoting many traditions to that effect.⁷ Thus he was of a similar opinion to al-Suhaylī, that the verdict involved in this tradition was mandūb.

1. Text, vol.7, p.97.

2. Ibid.

3. Al-Muwatta', Book of hair, dying the hair, p.464.

4. Ibid.

5. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.3, p.184.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., pp.183-184.

The validity of one's own ijtihād

Al-Suhaylī discussed the validity of reaching one's own legal decision (ijtihād).¹ The occasion was the Prophet's command to his Companions not to pray the ^{after}noon (al-^caṣr) prayer till they reached Banū Qurayza.² It was reported that the prayer was due before they reached their destination. Thus some of the Companions of the Prophet prayed at the correct time arguing that what the Prophet meant was to encourage them to go quickly so as to be there before the prayer was due.³ However, others who did not pray were taking the literal meaning of the Prophet's words. When that was brought to the Prophet's notice he did not reproach any of them. Instead he regarded both decisions as valid.⁴

Al-Suhaylī pointed out that there were two legal implications in this account. Firstly, it indicates that if someone takes the literal meaning of a tradition or even a verse of the Qur'ān and acts according to it, he should not be reproached.⁵ Apparently this remark here is in favour of the Ash^cariyya. Secondly, he pointed out that this tradition is a proof that Muslims are permitted to exercise personal judgement in such matters (furū^c). The result must be valid; even if different men reach different conclusions, all should be regarded as right provided that each had the qualifications for making legal opinions and honestly exercised his judgement. To support his argument he quoted the verse, "To Solomon We inspired the (right) understanding of the matter. To each (of them) We gave judgement and knowledge" (XXI-

-
1. Personal exertion in solving a problem or determining a course of action. See al-Mustasfā, vol.2, p.103 seq.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.284.
 3. Ibid., p.326.
 4. Ibid. cf. p.284.
 5. Ibid., p.325. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.180-181.

79), saying that it is the root of this practice.¹

However, the ruling involved in this verse is slightly different from that in the tradition, as both David and Solomon made judgements concerning the case in question. According to Qur'ān exegesis both were entitled to rewards from God; Solomon for his knowledge and right decision, David for putting his best endeavour in administering justice.

Our author continues the discussion on a theological basis. He said it is not impossible for a thing to be right with regard to someone and wrong to another. Thus if a Muslim according to his own ijtihād arrived at a decision that something is lawful, whereas the same thing was considered as unlawful according to the ijtihād of another Muslim, each of them should act accordingly and both judgements are valid.² What is impossible according to our author, is for the same person to treat the same thing as lawful and unlawful. He goes on to say that two parties found this rule most incomprehensible, that is the Zāhirites and the Mu^ctazila. The first group confined the derivation of judgements entirely to the text nuṣūṣ. Hence they regard it as impossible to find the judgement and its opposite in the same text unless one of them is abrogated.³ The second group, i.e. the Mu^ctazila, confined judgements to the appreciation of reason. According to them it is impossible for a thing to be good with regard to Zayd and bad with regard to ^cAmr, since good and bad are absolute.⁴

Alluding to al-Ash^carī's view, al-Suhaylī went on to say, for the rest of the Muslims who hold that prohibition and

1. Text, vol.6, p.326.

2. Ibid., pp.326-327. cf. al-Risāla, p.494 seq.; al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.180-181; Tabyīn, p.152.

3. Ibid., cf. al-Muḥallā, vol.1, pp.70-71.

4. Text, vol.6, p.326, cf. al-Fiṣal, vol.3, p.98.

permissibility of doing things are a mere judgement given by God, who can determine a thing prohibited for someone whose ijtihād led him to believe in its prohibition or vice versa; every mujtahid (i.e. one who exercises ijtihād) is right as long as he decides the case with sincerity and judged by what he thought to be the fairest, provided that he had the qualification for making a decision on the basis of ijtihād.¹ This was the opinion of al-Ash^cari who held that every mujtahid is right as long as people do not differ about fundamental principles, but only about secondary conclusions. According to him, each one's ijtihād leading to a judgement is valid and entitled to reward and recompense for it.² Both al-Shāfi^cī and al-Ghazālī were of the same opinion.³

With regard to the main question, i.e. the Prophet's command to his Companions not to pray until they reached Banū Qurayza, Ibn al-Qayyim supported the first party, arguing that although the Prophet accepted both judgements, one of them must be more sound. According to him, the first group, those who prayed in time, were the best as they combined two merits; praying at the correct time and participating in jihād. Thus they proved to have been more knowledgeable than those who took the surface meaning of the Prophet's words. He went on to say particularly, it was the ḥaṣr prayer, and the stress upon performing it in its correct time, is laid down in the Qur'ān.*

* * * * *

-
1. Text, vol.6, pp.326-327. cf. al-Risāla, pp.505, 510; al-Mustasfa, vol.1, pp.180-181.
 2. Tabyīn, p.152 cf. The theology of al-Ash^carī, p.175.
 3. Al-Risāla, pp.487-503.
 4. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.72. It is the opinion of the majority that the reference in the verse "Guard strictly your (habit of) prayers, especially the middle prayer" (II-238), is to the ḥaṣr prayer. See Tafsīr, vol.2, pp.554-555. Cf. al-Muḥallā, vol.4, p.253.

Ibn Ishāq reported on the authority of Ma^cbad ibn Ka^cb ibn Mālik, that al-Barā' ibn Ma^crūr was the first man to pray towards the Ka^cba following his own opinion that such a thing should be done.¹ That incident took place on a journey from Medina to Mecca before the Prophet's hijra. It was related that when he reached Mecca and asked the opinion of the Prophet, he said to him, "You have had a qibla if you had kept to it".² So al-Barā' returned to the Prophet's qibla and prayed towards Jerusalem.

Al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication in this account, saying that the Prophet did not order him to repeat the prayers which he prayed towards the Ka^cba because he was following his own ijtihād thinking it was right to do so.³ This tradition apparently lends support to al-Ash^carī's previously mentioned opinion, i.e. every mujtahid is on the right.⁴

Our author added that this tradition is a text proof for those who hold that the Prophet prayed towards Jerusalem while he was in Mecca; this was the opinion of Ibn ^cAbbās. Others opposed this saying that he only prayed towards Jerusalem for seventeen or sixteen months after his hijra.⁵ According to him there were two abrogations involved with regard to the qibla. The first was an abrogation of a tradition by a tradition, i.e. facing Jerusalem instead of the Ka^cba. The second was an abrogation of a tradition by the Qur'ān, i.e. facing the Ka^cba instead of Jerusalem.⁶ After quoting the abrogating verse (II-150), al-Suhaylī alluded to a tradition narrated on the authority of Ibn ^cAbbās, saying that it

1. Text, vol.4, p.80.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p.113.

4. See above, pp.156-7.

5. Ibid. cf. al-Risāla, p.125, Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.57.

6. Ibid., p.114.

revealed the origin of the obscurity, as he reported that when the Prophet was in Mecca he used to pray towards Jerusalem. At the same time he was always keen on turning his face towards the Ka^cba, i.e. the Ka^cba was always between him and Jerusalem.¹ According to al-Suhaylī this practice made it difficult for people to notice that he was praying towards Jerusalem until he migrated to Medina, where it was impossible to face both directions.²

However, in the same tradition concerning al-Barā' it is very evident that the people outside Mecca prayed towards Jerusalem, as it was reported that when al-Barā' told his companions about his decision to pray to the Ka^cba, they opposed him saying that, so far as they knew, the Prophet prayed towards Syria and they did not want to act differently.³

In saying that facing the Ka^cba instead of Jerusalem was an abrogation of a Sunna by the Qur'ān, al-Suhaylī has adopted the view of al-Ghazālī and rejected that of al-Shāfi'ī, as the latter held that only the Qur'ān abrogates the Qur'ān and the Sunna abrogates the Sunna.⁴ Al-Ghazālī responded to this, citing as an example of the abrogation of the Sunna by the Qur'ān the tradition cited above, i.e. facing the Ka^cba instead of Jerusalem.⁵ Thus al-Suhaylī seems to have been influenced by al-Ghazālī's views on naskh, as he asserts that the Qur'ān may be abrogated indifferently by the Qur'ān or by the Sunna, and that the Sunna may be abrogated by the Sunna or by the Qur'ān, both alike from God.⁶

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.114.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid., p.80.
 4. Al-Risāla, p.108.
 5. Al-Mustasfa, vol.1, pp.124, 125.
 6. Ibid., p.124. cf. p.146 above.

Legal problems connected with testimony

Al-Suhaylī pointed out that if al-^cAbbās, the uncle of the Prophet, had become a Muslim before the death of Abū Ṭālib, his testimony in his favour would have been accepted. In this he was referring to the last illness of Abū Ṭālib. It was reported that when the Prophet saw his grave condition, he urged him to accept Islam by testifying that "there is no god but Allāh", but Abū Ṭālib declined saying that he feared that his family would be abused after his death, and that Quraysh would think that he had only said it in his fear of death. However, shortly before his death al-^cAbbās saw him moving his lips and put his ear close to him. He then told the Prophet that Abū Ṭālib had spoken the word which he gave to him. The Prophet rejected this testimony of al-^cAbbās, saying that he did not hear it.¹ Al-Suhaylī pointed out the legal implication, saying that if al-^cAbbās was a Muslim, then the positive testimony should have been accepted, because if a just witness said "I heard" and another witness who is more just than him said: "I did not hear", the latter should be rejected as negative testimony can^{be} due to some reasons preventing the witness from hearing.² Besides sound traditions which support the fact that Abū Ṭālib died as an unbeliever. He then quoted the verse, "It is not fitting for the Prophet and those who believe, that they should pray for forgiveness for pagans, even though they be of kin, after it is clear to them that they are companions of the fire" (IX-113). The verse is believed to have been sent down concerning the Prophet when he prayed for Abū Ṭālib.³ However, the verse was also believed to have been revealed when the Prophet prayed for his mother's

1. Text, vol.4, p.27.

2. Ibid., p.28, cf. Sharḥ al-Mawāhib, vol.1, pp.291-2.

3. Text, vol.4, p.28. cf. Tafsīr, vol.11, p.40; Ibn Kathīr, vol.2, p.394.

forgiveness.¹ With regard to the main question, i.e. positive testimony, both al-Ghazalī and al-Shāfi^c ī were of a similar opinion to that adopted by al-Suhayli.²

Legal problems connected with buyū^c

It was reported on the authority of Jābir ibn ^c Abd Allāh that on their way back from the raid of dhat al-riqā^c the Prophet asked him if he would sell him his camel. Jābir agreed and asked him to make an offer. The Prophet said he would give him a dirham but Jābir refused. He then offered him two dirhams and Jābir still refused. The Prophet then went on raising his offer until it amounted to one ounce of gold. Jābir then accepted the offer.³

Al-Suhaylī commented saying: The legal implication in this tradition is the permissibility of bargaining and making an initial offer which is not likely to be the real price for the commodity in question.⁴ He goes on to say there is another tradition which supports this, as it was recorded that if someone willingly purchases a commodity for a price which is not likely to be the real value, then the transaction would be regarded as valid and irrevocable, providing that there is no deceit.⁵ Our author speculated that probably the Prophet did that intentionally because, according to another version, each time he makes an offer he invokes blessings on Jābir.⁶

-
1. Ibid.
 2. Al-Risāla, incorporated with al-Umm, vol.1, pp.51-65. cf. al-Mustasfa, vol.1, pp.155, 167-168.
 3. Text, vol.6, pp.224-225.
 4. Ibid., p.246.
 5. Ibid. cf. al-Muwaṭṭa', Book of business transactions, 31; al-Muqaddimāt, p.601.
 6. Text, vol.6, p.246.

Al-Suhaylī then discussed the opinion of jurists with regard to this question. First he pointed out that this tradition was a bone of contention among jurists. Some of them regard it as a proof for the permissibility of a transaction that involves a stipulated selling; as according to the version recorded by al-Bukhārī and Muslim, Jābir said: I sold it to him on the condition that I would be permitted to ride it until I reached Medina;¹ whereas according to other jurists this form of business transaction is disapproved of, if it happened, both the selling and the stipulation are invalid and the whole transaction should be cancelled. This is the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Shāfi'ī² while Mālik adopted an intermediate view, as he regarded it valid in certain forms of transactions.³ Those who disapproved of it, cited as a proof the tradition narrated by ^CAmr ibn Shu^Cayb on the authority of his father that the Prophet forbade selling ~~with~~ stipulation or selling ~~with~~ credit.⁴ They disregarded the tradition on Jābir's authority on the ground that it is incoherent because there are numerous differences between the different versions. They also relied on the tradition concerning Burayra the slave girl whom ^CĀ'isha wanted to buy and manumit, but her masters stipulated that her walā'⁵ would go to them.⁶ When ^CĀ'isha

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.246. cf. al-Bukhārī, vol.3, pp.176-77. Muslim Kitāb al-Buyū^C (3-841); al-Muqaddimāt, pp.544-546.
 2. See al-Umm, vol.3, p.35.
 3. Al-Muwatta', book 31. cf. al-Mudawwana, vol.4, pp.220-221, al-Muqaddimāt, pp.544, 546.
 4. Text, vol.6, p.246.
 5. Walā': The tie of clientage, established between a freed slave and the person who frees him, whereby the freed slave becomes integrated into the family of the person. Muwatta', Glossary.
 6. Text, vol.6, p.247. cf. al-Bukhārī, vol.3, p.204.

informed the Prophet to that effect he said, "Buy and manumit her, for the walā' is for the one who manumits". They argued that the Prophet regarded the sale as valid but the condition as invalid. According to al-Bukhārī's version of this tradition, the Prophet said, "Why do some people impose conditions which are not present in God's laws? If someone imposes such a condition, then that condition is invalid even if he imposes one hundred conditions, for God's conditions are more binding and reliable".¹ According to this tradition it is very obvious that the Prophet abrogated the condition on the ground that walā' is for the one who manumits. This apparently supports the opinion of Mālik who approved of some forms of transactions involving stipulations.² Although al-Suhaylī did not state his own opinion, it could be inferred from the context that he was of the opinion of al-Shāfi^cī as he did not regard the tradition discussed above as a proof for the permissibility of a transaction that involves a stipulated selling. However, the legal implication which he drew from this tradition lends support to the Mālikites.³

* * * * *

It is reported that Abū Jahl met the Prophet and said to him, "Either you will stop cursing our gods or else we will curse the God you worship". So God revealed concerning this matter, "Curse not those to whom they pray other than God lest they curse God wrongfully through lack of knowledge"* (VI-108).

Al-Suhaylī commented on this, saying: In this verse there

-
1. Al-Bukhārī, op. cit.
 2. Al-Mudawwana, vol.4, pp.133 seq. cf. al-Muqaddimāt, pp.544-546.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.246, al-Muwaṭṭa', book 31. cf. al-Muqaddimāt, p.601.
 4. Text, vol.3, p.288.

is one of the fundamental tenets of the Mālikites, the necessity of guarding oneself against dharā'i^c, i.e. those acts which are apparently not prohibited but can lead to prohibited ones. For instance, some forms of transactions should be avoided for fear of usury. The Malikites observe it in business transactions and other judgements.¹ Al-Suhaylī added that although the cursing of the gods of the unbelievers was not evil, they could use it as a means to curse God and for this reason the Prophet was prohibited from cursing their gods. He continues: However, dharā'i^c vary, some of them are very near to committing unlawful deeds, while others are further. Accordingly, there should be indulgence or restriction.² The Shāfi^c ites are of the opposite opinion. According to them the above-quoted verse is not relevant in business transactions. They do not hold as prohibited any form of transaction as long as one can avoid usury, since suspecting a Muslim and feeling malice towards him is unlawful.³ They quote further a tradition from ʿUmar who was reported to have said: The sin of usury applies only to those who practise it with intent, and the famous saying of the Prophet: Deeds are but by intention and one is rewarded according to his intention. He added that the Shāfi^c ites further refuted the relevancy of the verse to the observance of dharā'i^c, on the grounds that the prohibition of cursing the unbelievers' gods is not of this type, since it implies no charge of suspicion against a Muslim or any restrictions laid upon him.⁴ Moreover, if dharā'i^c should be avoided lest one inadvertently make lawful what God has made unlawful, in the same manner one should avoid making unlawful what God has made lawful; both practices are to be shunned. God forbids usury, and makes bay^c lawful. According

1. Text, vol.3, p.314. cf. al-Mudawwana, vol.4, pp.117-144; al-Muqaddimāt, pp.524-546.

2. Ibid.

3. Al-Umm, vol.3, p.65, cf. p.31; al-Risāla, pp.514, 515.

4. Text, vol.3, p.314.

to the Shāfi^c ites, the definition of usury is well known; any form of transactions other than that should be regarded as bay^c.¹

Apparently al-Suhaylī was of the latter opinion as he presented all their arguments. However, al-Shāfi^c ī, although not in favour of guarding oneself against dharā'i^c, held some forms of business transactions as prohibited, namely those designated as such by the Prophet. Otherwise he stated that sound contracts should not be made invalid merely on the grounds of suspicion.²

Besides pointing out that ḥajj and ghusl from major ritual impurity were customs which remained from the religion of Abraham, al-Suhaylī explained that usury³ was prohibited before Islam as well. He inferred this from an account concerning the rebuilding of the Ka^cba in the era prior to Islam, when a man asked Quraysh not to bring into the building illgotten gains, the hire of a harlot,⁴ nor money taken in usury, nor anything resulting from wrongdoing and violence. Al-Suhaylī asserted that this tradition was an indication of the ancient prohibition of usury, either in the religion of Abraham or in an other religion, although he did not specify in which preceeding law. There is a verse with the same meaning in the Old Testament: "If you lend money to one of my people among

1. Text, vol.3, p.315. cf. al-Umm, vol.3, p.31.

2. Al-Umm, vol.3, p.65; cf. p.31.

3. The definition of usury/^{us}undue profit made, not in the way of legitimate trade, out of loans of gold and silver, and necessary articles of food, such as wheat, barley, dates and salt (according to the list mentioned by the Prophet).

4. Cf. al-Qālī, vol.2, p.275.

you who is needy, do not be like a money-lender; charge him no interest" (Exodus XXII-26). Our author also enumerated the evils of usury and elucidated how strongly God addressed those who deal in it. He quoted the verse, "O ye who believe, Fear God and give up what remains of your demand for usury, If ye are indeed believers. If ye do it not take notice of war from God and his Apostle" (II-278)¹. He also quoted a tradition on the authority of ^CA'isha to the effect that dealing in usury abrogates jihād.²

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

It has been previously said that at the time of ^{the}Almoravids the doctrines of the school of Mālik were predominant to the extent that the Qur'an and hadīth were only referred to through these doctrines. Al-Suhaylī here has made a genuine attempt to reform this, as he examined what Mālik or other jurists said in the light of the practice of the Prophet. By doing this al-Suhaylī has placed the sīra in its proper perspective, making it a source for legislation. Indeed the Prophet's practice is, to him, a living example of the application of both Qur'ān and hadīth.

For one reason however, al-Suhaylī confined himself almost exclusively to the views of Mālik and al-Shāfi^Cī. This was due to the fact that the Almohad dynasty was an Ash^Carite state. As Professor Watt observed, there had been always a link between the Ash^Carite school and those two schools of jurisprudence and al-Ash^Cari was claimed by both schools.

In this Chapter it can also be seen clearly that al-Suhaylī was the first to use the sīra systematically for legal deductions. Thus he was the first to write on fiqh al-sīra and not Ibn al-Qayyim as has been widely recognised. The latter was obviously influenced by the work of our author.

1. Text, vol.4, pp.25, 26.

2. Ibid. cf. al-Umm, vol.3, pp.68, 69.

CHAPTER V

Theological Implications

Although al-Suhaylī did not dedicate his book directly to Abū Ya^cqūb, the leader of the Almohads, it was the thought of his book being read by him that encouraged our author to compile al-Rawḍ. As has been mentioned, Abū Ya^cqūb favoured philosophical and theological discussion and he was very much inclined to the Ash^carite doctrines which dominated the thinking of the early Almohads to such an extent that it was described as an Ash^carite state.¹ Therefore it was probably to make it clear that he was also an Ash^carite, that al-Suhaylī interpolated some of their arguments into his commentary. Moreover he sometimes introduced these arguments with the words "We say" referring to the Ash^cariyya, and "They say" referring to the Mu^ctazila. Nevertheless our author has his differences with regards to some of the methods and doctrines of the founder of the Ash^carite school, Abū al-Hasan ^cAlī ibn Ismā^cīl al-Ash^carī (d. 324/935). However that should not be surprising, particularly if we know that the school of Ash^cariyya has always been described as differing on certain concepts from the basic thesis of al-Ash^carī.

For instance, the interpretation of the corporeal terms applied to God, such as hands, face and sitting on the throne. Al-Ash^carī had said these were to be taken neither literally nor metaphorically, but bi lā kayf (without asking how).² The attitude of most of the later Ash^cariyya was that these terms should be interpreted metaphorically.³ Thus they agreed with the Mu^ctazila⁴ on this concept.

1. Text, vol.1, p.17. cf. Muslim Theology, p.240; EI,¹ "Almohad".

2. Al-Ibāna, p.9, cf. pp.37-41.

3. Al-Juwaynī p.88. cf. al-Tamhīd, 148-152.

4. Al-Uṣūl, p.227.

In opposition to the view of the Mu^Ctazila that God could not literally be seen,¹ al-Ash^Carī held that the vision of God in the world to come is a reality, though we cannot understand the manner of it.² Later Ash^Cariyya speculated many ways in which God can be seen without being limited or corporeal. However, al-Bāqillānī, to whom this development is attributed, had actually extended one of al-Ash^Carī's arguments.³

With regard to the attributes of God, al-Ash^Carī held that God had eternal attributes which are not his essence or other than his essence.⁴ Whereas the Mu^Ctazila held that God had no attributes distinct from his essence.⁵ Later Ash^Cariyya held the attributes to be other than his essence.⁶

As for God's omnipresence, the Mushabbiha⁷ held that God is localized on His throne.⁸ The Mu^Ctazila, who held that God is ubiquitous, rejected this view since it would imply that God is corporeal and limited. Al-Ash^Carī held that God was when no place was, and He was just the same after creating the throne as He had been before creating it.⁹ Later Ash^Cariyya maintained a similar view to that of the Mu^Ctazila. Our author himself held this view; it was reported that he used to relate an account to that effect to the students in his

-
1. Al-Uṣūl, pp.232-276.
 2. Al-Ibāna, p.10. cf. pp.13-18.
 3. Al-Tamhīd, pp.36-38. cf. al-Luma^C, pp.62, 63; EI², "al-Bāqillānī".
 4. Al-Luma^C, pp.26-31. cf. al-Firaq, p.322.
 5. Al-Uṣūl, p.183
 6. Al-Tamhīd, p.153. cf. EI², "al-Bāqillānī"; "al-Juwaynī."
 7. The Anthropomorphists. "Tashbīh" means "likening", in This case likening God to man. cf. al-Firaq, p.214 seq.
 8. Al-Ibāna, p.37.
 9. Tabyīn, p.150.

circle, on the authority of Ibn al-^CArabī from Abū al-Ma^Cālī al-Juwaynī:¹ On one occasion Abū al-Ma^Cālī was asked how he knew God was ubiquitous. He replied by quoting a ḥadīth, in which the Prophet was reported to have said: "Do not give me preference to Yūnus ibn Matta" (Jonah). The people were astounded and retorted that the ḥadīth was irrelevant, but on further explanation Abū al-Ma^Cālī revealed that Yūnus had been swallowed by a whale and taken to the depths of the sea while the Prophet, on the day of the ascent to heaven had been led to the highest of the heavens, even so neither of them was closer to God.² This account besides pointing out that the later Ash^Cariyya were making use of one of the Mu^Ctazila's views,³ also elaborates on two other statements previously mentioned. First, that by the time of al-Suhaylī, theology was openly discussed while at the Al-Moravid time it was entirely restricted. Second, that it emphasised a suggestion previously made concerning our author being taught theology by Ibn al-^CArabī.⁴

Al-Suhaylī uses Ibn Ishāq's account of the search by ^CAbd Allāh ibn al-Thāmir⁵ for the greatest name of God (al-ism

-
1. The Imām of the two sanctuaries. He was head of the Nizāmiyya college in Nishapur until his death in 478/1035. Al-Ghazālī was his greatest pupil. As a theologian his position is very similar to that of al-Bāqillānī. The chief matter to notice is an apparent slight shift from the position of al-Ash^Carī towards that of the Mu^Ctazila. Islamic Philosophy p.112. cf. EI,² "Juwaynī".
 2. Text, vol.1, p.27. cf. al-Dībāj, p.150.
 3. EI,¹ "Al-Mu^Ctazila".
 4. See pp.3,5 above
 5. A man from Najrān who preached pure Christianity in the time prior to Islam. Text, vol.1, pp.196, 197.

al-a^czam)¹ as an opportunity to introduce a discussion on some theological doctrines that arise out of the idea of the greatest name of God.

First he pointed out that scholars were of different opinions with regard to the question of the greatest name of God. One group rejected the idea altogether arguing that if any reference to the greatest name occurs in an account or a tradition, it should be understood as great;² because all the names of God are equally great and meritorious. When we pray to God using any of His names, it is He who decides whether to answer our prayer or not.³ Thus this group did not associate the answering of a prayer with the use of a particular name of God. Furthermore, they argued that if such a name really existed, the Prophet would have known it as it was unlikely that he was denied it. Al-Suhaylī then produced the argument of another group which he did not specify. They argued theoretically that the names of God are part of His speech and it is impossible to prefer one part of His speech to another, as it is one speech from one God.⁴

Al-Suhaylī responds by agreeing with the basic proposition that the names of God are part of His speech. However, he argues that it is possible for God to prefer one name to another by using the argument concerning works. According to him it is correct, both rationally and from the standpoint of revelation, to say that God prefers one good work to another good work, and one word of dhikr to another word

-
1. Al-ism al-a^czam is believed to bring an immediate answer when used in supplication. Text, vol.1, pp.196, 197. cf. Jawāhir al-Qur'ān, p.47.
 2. Text, vol.1, p.196. cf. al-Luma^c, p.22; al-Rāzī, vol.2, pp.307-308.
 3. Text, vol.1, p.196.
 4. Ibid. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.2, p.307.

of dhikr.¹

For instance jihād and prayer are more valuable than many other good works; in the same manner the obligatory ordinances are preferred to the supererogatory. Taking up the idea of prayer, he suggests that the names of God in prayer are a kind of dhikr and part of it can be more beneficial than another. Though he argues in principle that the names of God are part of His speech, he continues to maintain that nonetheless it is possible that the use of the names of God (thus His speech) in prayer may involve different rewards, some greater and some lesser. Hence one name of God is more influential with God and could be more swiftly answered.² It is obvious that al-Suhaylī, in saying this, was influenced by al-Ghazālī, who was the first to devote a book to the classification of the verses of the Qur'ān according to their merits.³

Our author then moves on to a discussion of the theological nature of the speech of God (kalām Allāh). Here he maintains the Ash^carite position using "We say" to introduce his view, which is in fact the same view as al-Ash^carī and al-Ghazālī on the attributes of God, namely that ~~they~~ cannot be said to be either the essence of God itself, or other than the essence.⁴ Similar was his opinion on the names of God which are part of His speech. So ~~they are~~ not His essence or other than it.⁵

Al-Suhaylī then moves the discussion to the nature of our speech, probably prompted by the argument of the use of the

1. Text, vol.1, p.197. cf. al-Rāzī, p.307.

2. Text, vol.1, p.198.

3. See Jawāhir al-Qur'ān, cf. p.37.

4. Text, vol.1, p.199, 200. cf. al-Iqtisād, p.64.

5. Text, vol.1, p.199.

names of God in dhikr. He maintains that our words are in fact created, as he said: if we utter the names of God by our created tongues and originated utterances, our speech is but a part of our works which are themselves created.¹ To support his view he quoted the verse, "It is God who has created you and what you do" (XXXVII-96). This latter view is clearly the Ash^Carite doctrine on the creation and determination of man's acts by God.² However, al-Ash^Carī disapproved of saying that any part of kalām Allāh is created.³ But he said the Qur'ān, as written in the Mushaf, is ḥibārat kalām Allāh.⁴

From the discussion of the nature of man's speech, al-Suhaylī turns once more to the nature of God's speech. He condemned the Mu^Ctazila for what he called their false allegation that kalām Allāh is originated (makhlūq).⁵ Man's speech may be created but for al-Suhaylī the speech of God most certainly is not created.⁶ Our author goes on to say that according to the false foundation of al-Mu^Ctazila, it follows that the attributes of God are other than His essence. Thus they hold as equal the speech of the Creator and that of man; both are originated and distinct from the essence.⁷

However, some later Ash^Cariyya, particularly al-Bāqillānī,⁸ and some of the Mu^Ctazila too, held this view; namely that the attributes of God are other than his essence. But most of the Mu^Ctazila maintain that the attributes of God

1. Cf. al-Iqtiṣād, p.58.

2. Al-Ibāna, p.9. cf. al-Firaq, pp.327-328.

3. Al-Ibāna, p.32. cf. al-Uṣūl, p.528.

4. Ibid. cf. Tabyīn, p.150 ; al-Iqtiṣād, p.53 seq.

5. Text, vol.1, p.202. cf. al-Uṣūl, p.531; al-Firaq p.322; al-Ibāna, p.22.

6. See al-Firaq, p.325.

7. Text, vol.1, p.202. cf. al-Uṣūl, p.132.

8. Tamhīd, p.153.

are nothing but His essence itself.¹ Nevertheless all the Mu^c tazila agreed that two attributes of God are other than His essence, that is kalām (speech) and irāda (will).²

* * * * *

In explaining what are seemingly contradictory accounts, al-Suhaylī posed the question: how did the Prophet say that the most truthful word that a poet said is Labīd's verse, "Everything but God is vain",³ whereas the Prophet himself says in his soliloquies that God is true, His saying is true, His promise is true, heaven is true, hell is true and the resurrection is true.⁴ Al-Suhaylī then suggested two answers. The first is to understand the tradition as if he meant to say that everything but God and His mercy and His punishment is vain. The second is to know that, although heaven and hell are true, they are both perishable, since their continued existence depends entirely on God's will.⁵ He also seized the opportunity to insert one of the Ash^c ariyya views, saying that God has created immortality for the people of heaven and hell, as it could be understood according to those who hold that eternity is other than the essence, namely al-Ash^c arī. He added: God's eternity is not subject to extinction as He is the eternal.⁶

Al-Suhaylī maintained the same view when discussing the verses in which the word wajh, i.e. countenance, has occurred attributed to God.⁷ In the explanation of the verse, "All that

1. Al-Uṣūl, pp.182-200.

2. Cf. al-Iqtiṣād, p.60; al-Ibāna, p.46 seq.

3. Text, vol.3, p.334; Shamā'il, p.123.

4. Text, vol.3, p.350.

5. Ibid. cf. al-Firaq, p.319.

6. Text, vol.3, p.350. cf. al-Luma^c, p.31 fn.1.

7. Text, vol.4, p.35.

is on earth will perish, but the face of thy lord will abide forever full of majesty, bounty and honour" (LV-26-27),¹ he said: Given that the creation of heaven and earth signify and make manifest the omnipotence of God and His authority and that that creation will of necessity pass away in its appointed time, the emphasis in the verse is upon the fact that this coming to be and passing away does not affect God's authority or glory. The above is true because His glory existed before the creation of the heaven and earth and will endure after their annihilation, as it was in eternity, full of majesty, bounty and honour.²

Although our author did not mention any of the theologians in this instance, his argument seems to be a response to some of the Mu^ctazila, namely Abū al-Hudhayl al-^cAllāf, a leader of the Mu^ctazilite theology in Baṣra (d. 226/841), who held that God will no longer be omnipotent once His creation is annihilated.³ However, another theologian, an extreme Murji'ite, Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, agreed with the Ash^cariyya on this concept.⁴

* * * * *

Pertaining to the explanation of the word wajh as attributed to God, Ibn Ishāq reported that on one occasion the Prophet went to al-Tā'if to seek help. Despairing of getting any help, he sat down and prayed to God: "I take refuge in the light of Thy countenance wajh by which the darkness is illuminated".⁵ Our author then pointed out that three concepts

1. Text, vol.4, pp.48-49.

2. Ibid.

3. Al-Firaq, pp.323, 102; cf. p.319. cf. Muslim Theology, pp.136-140.

4. Al-Firaq, pp.103,199,200, Muslim Theology, p.138;

5. Text, vol.4, p.35.

in this prayer need to be explained: light, countenance and the illumination of darkness.¹

He started with the second, saying: There are two explanations for the word wajh if it is mentioned in revelation or tradition. The first signification is the contentment of God; he instances the verse: "Seeking His countenance" (XVIII-28) and "And have in their minds no favour from anyone for which a reward is expected in return but only the desire to seek for the countenance of their Lord most high" (XCII-20). What is meant here is the good pleasure or approval of God as that is the final cause for the practising servant of God. He goes on to say: Originally - one is to understand - when someone was pleased with you he would turn his face towards you, whereas, if he was angry, he would turn his back on you in order to hide his face from you. Thus the word wajh here is to represent God's approval and contentment.²

Al-Suhaylī then took Abū ^CUbayda to task for saying that the word wajh in these verses had no significance, but was just a connective word. He went on to say that, according to Abū ^CUbayda, the word wajh indicates nothing but the emphasis of the meaning.³ Al-Suhaylī described this as nonsense and added that it was the opinion of those who had strayed from understanding the eloquence of the Qur'ān, and that their nature had been hardened by mixing with non-Arabs. Similar to him are those who explained in the same manner the verse, "But the face of thy Lord will abide (for ever)" (LV-26),⁴ saying: Thy Lord will abide. They also explained "Everything will perish but His face" (XXVIII-88) as: everything will perish except Him, "His essence". Hence the use

1. Text, vol.4, p.48.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p.49. cf. Majāz, vol.2, p.112.

4. Text, vol.4, p.49.

of the word wajh is without significance according to them.¹ Probably al-Suhaylī's reproach was meant to be to the Mu^ctazila, who held that God's face is a "face of existence"; thus according to them, His countenance is His essence.² However, in the same manner the word was interpreted by later Ash^cariyya, like al-Bāqillānī and al-Juwaynī, who took it metaphorically as "essence" or "existence".³

Our author, who rejected all these views, exclaimed: "How can a word in the Qur'ān be described as without significance, when the Qur'ān is the book of wisdom?"⁴

According to him this is the second meaning of the word; it indicates what of His glory and majesty manifests itself to our eyes and minds.⁵ He goes on to say: From the standpoint of language wajh is the manifest part of any object of the senses or the intellect. Thus it is quite possible to say: This is the import of the question, i.e. wajh al-mas'ala, or this is the import of the discourse wajh al-ḥadīth, meaning what one understands thereby. Likewise with al-thawb, i.e. cloak, you call wajh what appears to your eyes from it. But minds cannot comprehend the true splendour of God, and that fraction which is manifested to us is necessarily far less than what is hidden. And it is on account of this that God is described as the exoteric and the esoteric, i.e. al-zāhir wa al-bāṭin. Hence when the people of Heaven see His sublime face, all they will perceive of His glory on the removal of the veil is what their perceptions make possible. But what is still imperceptible of His glory is far more than what they can perceive.⁶

1. Text, vol.4, p.49. cf. al-Kashshāf, vol.3, p.437; vol.4, p.446.

2. Al-Uṣūl, p.227. cf. Text, vol.4, p.49.

3. Al-Tamhīd, pp.148-152. cf. EI², "al-Bāqillānī", "al-Juwaynī".

4. Text, vol.4, p.49.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid. cf. al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.241-243.

However, on the question of the corporeal attributes as well as the question of the vision of God, opinions differ. As for the latter concept, the Hashwiyya-al-Mushabbiha¹ held that God will be seen, qualified and limited, like all things seen.² The Mu^C tazila held that God will not be seen in any state.³ Al-Ash^C arī followed a middle course, holding that God will be seen but without any limits or qualification; just as He sees us, without Himself being limited or qualified, so we shall see Him without His being limited or qualified.⁴ The later Ash^C arite scholars, although admitting the vision of God, endeavoured to explain away the literal meaning of it. According to al-Bāqillānī, vision is a perception, similarly⁵ the other senses. He explained this saying: God provides us with the necessary knowledge gained by means of the senses; nevertheless naming the perceptions which exist through the senses by means of the names of the various ways of sensing, is purely metaphorical. It is clear that the perception of an object touched is other than the act of touching; the perception of an object seen, other than the act of seeing, and so on.⁵

-
1. Cf. A.S. Halkin's art. "The Hashwiyya", Journal of the American Oriental Society, 54 (1934), 1-28; Magālāt, p.6,
 2. Tabyīn, p.149. cf. al-Iqtisād, p.35; al-Uṣūl, p.233.
 3. Al-Uṣūl, p.232. cf. Tabyīn, p.149, al-Firaq, p.324.
 4. Al-Ibāna, p.17; cf. p.19; Tabyīn, pp.149-150; al-Iqtisād, pp.30-35.
 5. Al-Tamhīd, pp.36-38. cf. p.249. Al-Bāqillānī, in saying this, was certainly having in mind al-Ash^C arī's arguments with regard to touching and tasting, etc. He said it is possible for God to produce a perception of a thing in the organs of taste, touch, etc. Al-Luma^C, p.63. cf. The Theology of al-Ash^C arī, p.47; al-Tamhīd, pp.36-38.

Although al-Suhaylī reached the same conclusion as al-Bāqillānī, nevertheless he seems to have been influenced by Ibn Hazm's method: he resorted to grammatical and lexicographical devices to attain the same end, and had regarded ta'wīl with abhorrence.¹

However, on this question, i.e. corporeal terms applied to God, our author does not merely differ with the founder of the school to which he belongs, but even goes so far as to reproach him. In the opinion of al-Ash^carī, he says, regarding the face, eye and hand of God, all are real attributes whose precise nature is unknown to us, both rationally or from the standpoint of tradition.² Al-Suhaylī described this as obscurity (ʿujma), while the Qur'ān is in a clear Arabic language which all Arabs understand. Nor is it possible in their language that "face" could be understood as an attribute. He went on to say: Originally there was no difficulty for the believers or for the non-believers in understanding the meaning of this verse, which at the end of time³ became ambiguous and the need arose for it to be discussed. None of the believers was reported to have asked the Prophet or enquired at any time about the verse, "And the face of thy Lord will endure" (LV-26-27), because the believers at the time had no doubts or fears of likening God with creatures. Even the non-believers at that time did not use this as an argument in their attempts to refute the Qur'ān, as they did with another verse, "Verily ye (unbelievers), and what ye worship besides God, are but fuel

1. Muslim Theology, p.246.

2. Text, vol.4, p.49. cf. al-Ibāna, pp.37-41; Tabyīn, p.150.

3. Peculiar things are always associated with the end of time. Hence al-Suhaylī uses the expression to emphasise the peculiarity of such questions.

of Hell to it will ye (surely) go" (XXI-98).¹ It is also nowhere recorded that one of the non-believers said: Muhammad claims that God is like no one of His creatures, and yet he has attributed to Him a face, two hands, etc. This is a proof that they did not find any difficulty in comprehending this verse and they understood its meaning without any likening of God to creatures. They knew from the sublime nature and the beauty of the metaphor that the Qur'ān is of a miraculous style. Thus neither did they attempt to produce its like, nor assume any contradiction in it.²

Al-Suhaylī's views with regard to the questioning of these verses could be supported by the fact that the word yas'alūnaka (they ask you) occurred fifteen times in the Qur'ān; none of them is in connection with face or hand. They asked him about the fighting in the sacred months (II-217), and concerning wine and gambling (II-219) and about the orphans (II-220). They also asked him about menstruation (II-

1. This verse was used by al-Ash^c arī as one of the bases on which he vindicates cilm al-kalām, i.e. theology. He quoted it as the basis in correcting the sophistry of his adversaries. For when this verse was revealed, ^cAbd Allāh ibn al-Zibā ^crā said: By the lord of the Ka^cba I have triumphed over Muhammad. He then said to the Prophet: "O Muhammad, do you not claim that Jesus and ^cUzayr and the angels were worshipped?" The Prophet was astonished by his ignorance as God did not say "And everything which you worship, apart from God". Al-Ash^c arī, Risāla, The Theology of al-Ash^c arī, p.128-129.

2. Text, vol.4, pp.50-53. At this point al-Suhaylī referred the reader to his treatise on the meaning of hands and eye as attributed to God.

222), about booty (VIII-1), mountains (XX-105) and spirit (XVII-85), etc. A western scholar, D. MacDonald, stated one of the reasons for the rise of the questioning spirit; He said that in the first twenty or thirty years after Muḥammad's death, the Muslims were much too preoccupied with the propagation of their faith to think about what that faith was exactly. Thus it seems that the questioning spirit in this direction was aroused comparatively late and remained for some time on what might be called a private basis. Others hold different views.¹

After tackling the question of countenance, al-Suhaylī, as he promised, explained the meaning of light and the illumination of darkness.² He said: As for light it is the manifestation and the unveiling of the Divine truth. He then explained the Prophet's words, "With it the darkness is illuminated", saying what he meant was the illumination of its substrata. According to him the substrata of darkness were hearts which were full of darkness of ignorance and doubts. They were illuminated by the light of God.³ The commentators said concerning the verse, "The symbol of His light" (XXIV-35), that the symbol of His light in the heart of a believer is as a niche (mishkāṭ). Thus it is the light of faith and cognition (of God), which removes all darkness and doubt. Ka^c b said: the niche is the symbol of his comprehension, the lamp is the symbol of his tongue, and the glass is the symbol of his chest or heart, i.e. the heart of the Prophet.*

With regard to the Prophet's prayer, "I seek refuge in the light of Thy countenance", al-Suhaylī pointed out that if he had said in your light, it would have been good too. But he implored Him by means of that which He had put in his

1. Muslim Theology, p.122, cf. al-Awā'il, vol.1, p.266.

2. See above pp.174-75.

3. Text, vol.4, p.53.

4. Ibid. cf. Tafsīr, vol.18, p.135 seq.

heart of His light. Thus by means of God's grace the Prophet implored His grace, and by means of His mercy and bounty, he implored His mercy and bounty.¹

Al-Suhaylī added that the word "darkness" here could also refer to the darkness perceived by the senses and its illumination signifies the Creator. In the same manner the word "light" could be understood as light perceived by the senses, which points to Him, the Light of light, i.e. He manifests it.²

In this way al-Suhaylī interpreted the word nūr, i.e. light, both metaphorically as the light of faith and cognition of God, and literally as light perceived by the senses. Ibn al-Qayyim rejected the former meaning, arguing that God has called Himself "light", al-nūr, amongst His beautiful names and it is impossible that God calls Himself light while He is not light.³

* * * * *

Pertaining to the corporeal terms, al-Suhaylī elaborated the information to deal with the word carsh, the throne of God. Ibn Ishāq reported that when Sa^cd ibn Mu^cādh died, the angel Gabriel came to the Prophet and asked him who it was that had caused such commotion in heaven.⁴ It was also reported that ^cĀ'isha met Sa^cd's cousin outside Mecca and asked him why he did not show more grief for one whose arrival had shaken the very throne of God.⁵

Al-Suhaylī made a comment to the effect that some

-
1. Text, vol.4, p.53.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ṣawā^ciq, vol.2, pp.188-205.
 4. Text, vol.6, p.302. cf. p.322.
 5. Ibid.

scholars tried to explain away the meaning by suggesting that the shaking of the throne was a metaphor for the joy in heaven at Sa^cd's arrival; others claimed that the angelic bearers of the throne were meant.¹ Our author, adopting an Ash^carite and a Zāhirite thesis here, asserted that the throne is a created object and so it can move.² Therefore no-one has the right to depart from the plain meaning of the words. Moreover the tradition is authentic, while traditions like that of al-Barā', to the effect that it was Sa^cd's bier that shook, are rightly ignored by the learned.³ He goes on to point out that al-Bukhārī accepted the tradition, not only on the authority of Jābir, but also on the report of a number of other Companions of the Prophet. For this reason al-Suhaylī finds it most surprising that Mālik is said to have rejected this tradition, despite the soundness of its transmission and the multitude of narrators, and he added that it may be that what they said of Mālik in this connection is not true.⁴

Further evidence of al-Suhaylī's views of carsh as being a created object, can be seen in his comment on the report of the deputy of Banū Tamīm. It was reported in the Sīra that

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.341, Ahkām, Vol.2, p.796.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.340, cf. Al-Fīraq, p.321; al-Muḥalla, vol.1, p.7; Ihyā', vol.1, p.124.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.341.
 4. Ibid. The Arabic word can, which appears in this last statement of al-Suhaylī, seems to have been misrepresented in the text which I used or that used by A. Guillaume, as he translated the last part, "It may be that Mālik did not regard the tradition as sound" (Life of Muḥammad, xxiv), while what al-Suhaylī meant according to my text was the afore-mentioned meaning, as the word was can (Text, vol.6, p.341), and not cind as translated by A. Guillaume. However both readings fit the context.

after their orator spoke, the Prophet asked Thābit ibn Qays ibn al-Shammās to answer him. Thereupon Thābit got up and said, "Praise be to God who created heavens and earth and established His rule therein, and His knowledge encompasses His kursī (i.e. lit. seat)".¹

Al-Suhaylī, alluding to the latter concept, said that there was a response here to those who say His kursī is His omniscience and also to those who say it is His omnipotence, because it is not likely His knowledge will be described as encompassing these two afore-mentioned attributes.² Thus His kursī is what encompasses the heavens and earth and it is inferior to His throne as it was recorded in the traditions. Hence His omniscience does extend over His kursī which encompasses everything minute or great/^{generally} or in particular. He quoted the opinion of al-Hasan al-Baṣrī as a second view, which was that His kursī as mentioned in the Qur'ān is His ʿarsh, i.e. throne.³ The afore-mentioned tradition according to our author lends support to the opinion of al-Hasan, because the speaker did not confine the encompassing of knowledge to the kursī and what is inferior to it in particular excluding what is superior. So it is all possible that it is His throne (ʿarsh) that he meant by His kursī and that the two (ʿarsh and kursī) are synonymous.*

Al-Suhaylī went on to say that it was ascribed to Ibn ʿAbbās that he said what was meant by kursī is knowledge. If this version is authentic, then it should not be taken literally. Apparently Ibn ʿAbbās was alluding to the meaning of knowledge and the all encompassing quality of God which can be understood from the āyat al-kursī (II-255), since kursī

1. Text, vol.7, p.385.

2. Ibid., p.431. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.2, p.312.

3. Ibid. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.4, p.228.

4. Text vol.7, p.432. cf. al-Rāzī, op. cit.

in the Arabic language is the place in a king's throne where he puts his feet.¹ Thus if this place encompasses everything, it is likely that the king's knowledge, authority and power encompass everything.² According to al-Suhaylī there is no praise to God in saying that His kursī encompasses everything unless we are alluding to the extensiveness of His authority and knowledge. Otherwise, it is not a praise to describe the kursī itself as extensive, whereas no doubt, the verse (of the throne) occurred in the exposition of praise and glorification to the Most High and the Supreme Who feels no fatigue in guarding and preserving all His creatures, and He is the living and the eternal.³

After stating his opinion and that of al-Ḥasan and Ibn ʿAbbās, al-Suhaylī went on to say that al-Ṭabarī supported the latter's opinion arguing that the verse (II-255) is a proof of what he said. Besides, the Arabs call scholars karāsī (plural of kursī), from which they derived the word kurrāsa for a collection of papers which contains knowledge. He, i.e. al-Ṭabarī, quoted a poetical verse to demonstrate that karāsī meant knowledgeable:

They were surrounded by white faced men
And a league of karāsī (knowledgeable)
In all kinds of events when they occur.

However al-Ṭabarī stated that it was ascribed to Ibn ʿAbbās that he explained His kursī as His knowledge while others were of the opinion that the word kursī is there signifying the foot-stool of God.⁵ It is evident that al-

-
1. Cf. Ibn Manzūr, vol.8, p.78.
 2. Text, vol.7, p.432.
 3. Ibid. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.2, p.312.
 4. Ibid. cf. Tafsīr, vol.3, p.11.
 5. Tafsīr, vol.3, pp.9-10.

Suhaylī's arguments regarding this tradition were in conformity with his earlier remarks, as he endeavoured to show that both ḥarsh and kursī are created objects. Thus he used the tradition recorded in the Sīra to refute the metaphorical interpretation.

* * * * *

Our author also tackled other questions theologically, such as the salutation of stones to the Prophet. He pointed out that, although it is something which operates above the laws of nature, it should not be regarded as a miracle. The occasion was Ibn Ishāq's report that when the Prophet reached the age of forty and God willed to bestow His grace upon him and endow him with Prophethood, he would go forth on his affairs and journey far afield until he reached the valleys of Mecca where no house was in sight; and there was not a stone or tree that he passed by but would say, Peace be upon you, O Apostle of God! and the Apostle would turn to his right and left and looked behind him and he would see nothing but trees and stones".¹ Al-Suhaylī added another tradition recorded on the authority of the Prophet, that He said: "I recognise a stone in Mecca which used to pay me salutations before my advent, as a Prophet (and I recognise that even now).² He then pointed out that, according to some books of traditions, it was the "Black stone that used to greet the Prophet".³ But one would expect the Prophet to refer to it by its name, not as an indefinite stone. Our author, who was very fond of theological arguments, then said: Apparently it was a real greeting in the sense that God caused the stone to talk, just

1. Text, vol.2, p.379, cf. Ansāb, vol.1, p.104.

2. Ibid., p.388. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitāb al-Faḍā'il, p.1230.

3. Text, vol.2, p.388.

as he created the moaning in the palm-tree trunk.¹ He went on to say: speech (kalām), which is sounds and letters, does not necessitate life, knowledge and will, as kalām is sound like any other sounds and sound is an accident (ʿarad) in the opinion of the majority, but not al-Nazzām, who claims it is a body (jism).² Al-Ashʿarī identified sound as the collision (iṣṭikāk) between atoms (jawāhir), one against another, while al-Bāqillānī holds that it is not the collision itself, but something more than it. Al-Suhaylī added that if one considers speech as a self-subsistent attribute in the stone or tree, and sound as representing it, then the stone itself would have to have the attributes of life and knowledge. God knows best which really has taken place, whether the speech was associated with life and knowledge - in this case the stone could be regarded as a believer - or whether it was just sound, not accompanied by life; in either case it was one of the signs of Prophecy.³

Pertaining to the moaning of the trunk, al-Suhaylī said: calling it hanīn, i.e. moaning, in fact necessitates life (i.e. in the trunk). He then made some speculation concerning the salutation of the stones saying: Probably it was heard from some angels who inhabited these places. Hence the talking of the stones could be figurative. He instances the verse, "And ask the village" (XII-82), as what was meant was to ask the

-
1. Narrated by ʿUmar that the Prophet used to deliver his khuṭba while leaning against a trunk of a date-palm tree. When he had the pulpit made and used it instead, the trunk started moaning and the Prophet went to it, rubbing his hand over it (to stop its crying). See al-Bukhārī, vol.4, ḥadīth No.783.
 2. Text, vol.2, p.379. cf. al-Firaq, p.122.
 3. Ibid.

people in the village. In conclusion he said: but the first interpretation is more obvious. However, all should be regarded as signs of Prophecy but not as miracles. A miracle according to the principles of the theologians - as he said - is always accompanied by the Prophet's challenge that the people 'do likewise, and their failure¹ to do so is implied in this.

However the word mu^cjiza, i.e. miracle, does not occur in the Qur'ān. Another word with the same meaning is āya; it occurred in the Qur'ān three hundred and eight-two times in different forms. But it is not only used for miracles, as it is also used in a general sense for God's revelations as in II-39, and for other signs of God in history or nature. It has even been used for human signs as in XXVI-128.

The Prophet was reported to have said: Jesus used to cure the sick and bring the dead back to life, Moses was given the staff etc., and I have been given the permanent miracle of the Qur'ān till the hour is established".² Apparently in defining the word miracle, the theologians only used these miracles mentioned by the Prophet. Al-Baghdadī said: For something to be a miracle it must operate above the laws of nature, be performed by those claiming Prophethood, but must also be accompanied by a challenge to contemporaries to do likewise; the failure of their contemporaries to do so then validates their claim to be prophets, since only prophets can perform miracles. He added that if a Prophet performed only one miracle of this kind it would be sufficient to constrain the people to believe, otherwise they would be liable to receive the punishment of not believing.³ Al-Bāqillānī was of the same opinion, but he attributed the performance of miracles to God

1. Text, vol.2, p.379, cf. al-Iqtisād, p.93; al-Nubuwwāt, p.2 seq.

2. See Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, The miracles of the Prophet, vol.1, introduction.

3. Al-Firaq, p.334.

through the Prophets as a proof of their Prophethood.¹

As has been mentioned, the Prophet declared that his miracle was the Qur'ān; nevertheless a substantial number of proofs and signs of prophecy over and above this were attributed to him. Although they fall into the category of operating above the laws of nature, the definition discounts them as miracles because they were not accompanied by challenge. Al-Suhaylī preserved large numbers of them.²

* * * * *

A final question tackled by our author was concerning coercion. He used Ibn Ishāq's report on the compulsion of the early Muslims to renounce their religion in order to elaborate on some of the theological implications suggested by this account.³ He posed the question of whether the injunction to do something is also applicable to someone who is compelled to do it or not. Al-Suhaylī provided different views, saying that the Mu^ctazila denied this on the grounds that it is impossible to combine command and compulsion.⁴ While the Ash^cariyya held

-
1. Al-Tamhīd, p.255. cf. p.114. He devoted a book to the difference between miracle and other signs; Kitāb al-Bayān ^can al-Farq bayn al-Mu^cjiza wa al-Karāma wa al-Ḥiyal wa al-Kahāna wa al-Sihr, ibid., p.258.
 2. See for instance, Text, vol.4, p.250; vol.5, p.248; vol.7, pp.284, 428.
 3. Text, vol.3, pp.199-202.
 4. In relation between the divine will and human acts, the Mu^ctazila's view is that: The Creator wills that creatures should believe only by virtue of obedience for which they will deserve to be rewarded. But if he forced them to believe, they would be neither obedient nor deserving of reward. See al-Luma^c 52; Theology of al-Ash^carī, p.38.

held the opinion that it is possible,¹ because determination is an act of the heart and it is possible to do something with intention and determination even under compulsion. For instance, if someone was compelled to pray under the threat of death. He might intend in his prayer to obey the command of God, even though it might appear that he is praying for fear of people.

On the other hand, if someone was prevented from performing the prescribed prayers under the threat of death, it is permissible for him not to pray, but there is no contention that he is commanded to pray though the coercion deflects from him the guilt of omitting to pray.

Al-Suhayli also seized the opportunity to correct an error which was attributed to al-Qādī al-Bāqillānī, saying that those who attributed error to al-Qādī were wrong, as he was only recording the opinion of some jurists as saying: It is impossible to combine the will and intention to do something with compulsion. According to al-Suhaylī, al-Qādī rejected the above as false, because if it is conceivable to expect someone to do something reluctantly, under compulsion, then it is also possible to expect him to do it willingly.²

However, compulsion implies acting against one's own

-
1. Al-Ash^c arī held that the Creator possesses the power to do that which, were he to effect it, creatures would undoubtedly believe. See al-Luma^c, p.115. cf. al-Uṣūl, p.523.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.219. Al-Suhaylī attributed this quotation to al-Bāqillānī's book entitled al-Taqrīb wa al-Irshād, which was described as a large book dealing with uṣūl al-fiqh. See Tamhīd, p.258.

wishes and so cannot be combined with acting willingly. For this reason al-Suhaylī's inclination towards al-Qādi's view is not founded on logic.

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

It has been previously mentioned that the doctrine preached by Ibn Tumart - the founder of ^{the}Almohads - bears evident marks of the influence of both Ash^Carism and Zāhirite thinking. Nevertheless it can be seen clearly in this section that al-Suhaylī was a thorough going Ash^Carite while ignoring or sometimes condemning the Zāhirites. This could probably be explained by the fact that Ibn al-^CArabī, the immediate teacher of our author who was an Ash^Carite too, was a vigorous opponent of the Zāhirites. Al-Suhaylī must have been influenced by him.

CHAPTER VI

AL-SUHAYLĪ'S VIEWS ON QUR'ĀN EXEGESIS

Although al-Suhaylī in his commentary has discussed numerous verses of the Qur'ān and also provided reasons for the revelation of many others, not all these are discussed here. Above all, the aim is to focus on al-Suhaylī's contribution to the Sīra through his own views on the exegesis of the Qur'ān. Nevertheless another type of verse will also be discussed: namely, those verses which are subject to different ways of interpretation. This will be examined in order to elaborate on al-Suhaylī's position on their interpretation. As al-Suhaylī has followed the order in which the Sīra was presented by his predecessors, his discussion on Qur'ānic verses is scattered throughout his book. Hence in this chapter the order of suras in the Mushaf will be followed with a short reference to the account in the Sīra that brought about the discussion of these verses.

As has been mentioned, besides the interpretation of some verses from the Qur'ān, al-Suhaylī on several occasions pointed out the reasons for the revelation of several other Qur'ānic verses. So when the poetry of Širma ibn Abū Anas was quoted by Ibn Ishāq in the account of the hijra,¹ al-Suhaylī commented that it was concerning him (Širma) and ʿUmar ibn al-Khattāb that verse 187 of Sūrat al-Baqara was revealed.

It was reported that when the Muslims first started observing Ramḍān, eating, drinking and approaching one's wife were prohibited if one had already spent a part of the

1. Text, vol.4, p.301.

night asleep.¹ One night ^C Umar's wife told him that she had slept, nevertheless he approached her.² As for the other man, Sirma, it was reported that on one occasion he had worked in his field all day. When he went back home, he slept before breaking his fast. Thus he spent the night too fasting. The next day he went to his field and started working, but he was soon exhausted because of hunger and thirst. The Prophet passed by and asked him the reason. Thereupon Sirma told him what had happened. The Prophet took pity on him and his eyes were filled with tears. God then revealed the following indulgence that, "Permitted to you on the night of the fast, Is the approach to your wives. They are your garments and ye are their garments. God knoweth what ye used to do secretly among yourselves; But He turned to you and forgave you; so now associate with them, and seek what God hath ordained for you" (II-187). Al-Suhaylī said this part of the verse was revealed concerning ^CUmar, and God referred to him first on account of his greater merit. Then comes the part concerning Sirma, "And eat and drink, until you can distinguish the white from the black thread of dawn; Then complete your fast till the night appears" (II-187).³

The tradition concerning Sirma was slightly different when narrated by al-Bukhārī; Sirma was overwhelmed by sleep and slept before breakfast. When it was ⇒ midday on the following day he fainted and the Prophet was informed about the whole matter. Following this incident the verse above was revealed. As has been mentioned, al-Suhaylī frequently quotes traditions from memory. Thus al-Bukhārī's version is likely to be sounder.* However there is no contention with regard to this account being the reason for the revelation of the verse

1. Text, vol.4, p.389. cf. al-Tabarī, vol.2, p.163.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p.390.

4. Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-Ṣawm, vol.3, p.76. cf. al-Tabarī, vol.2, p.164.

in question. Perhaps al-Suhaylī's contribution is the opinion of Sūfis which he provided saying: Some Sūfis described this as an example of divine providence, saying that "C Umar had made a mistake through which God bestowed his mercy on the whole Muslim nation".¹

* * * * *

In the account of C Abd Allāh ibn al-Thamīr, who was said to have known al-ism al-a^Czam,² al-Suhaylī seized the opportunity to elaborate on this. He quoted a tradition to the effect that the Prophet asked Ubay: Which verse in the book of God do you regard as most glorious (a^Czam)? Thereupon Ubay answered by quoting verse 255 of Sūrat al-Baqara, "God there is no God but He, the living and the self-subsisting eternal". On hearing this, the Prophet was so pleased that he complemented Ubay for the knowledge he had.³

Taking up the idea of great and greatest with regard to the Qur'ān, al-Suhaylī commented that it is impossible to say that what the Prophet meant was to ask Ubay which verse is glorious because all the Qur'ān is glorious.⁴ His argument was meant to be a response to those who speculated that superlative verbs should not be used in connection with God's attributes, probably the Mu^C tazila.⁵ Hence (a^Czam) should be understood as (azīm) and (ahwan) as (hayyin).⁶ However,

1. Text, vol.4, p.390, cf. Ahkām, vol.1, p.91.

2. See p.169 above.

3. Text, vol.1, p.202. cf. p.197.

4. Ibid.

5. Cf. al-Kashshāf, vol.3, pp.476-477.

6. Text, vol.1, p.202. cf. al-Tabarī, vol.21, p.36; al-Rāzī, vol.6, p.523.

al-Suhaylī, who based his argument on the tradition quoted above, asserted that the Prophet's aim was to explain which verse when recited is more rewarded and swifter in answering. Furthermore our author considered the tradition in question as a proof that God has the greatest name (al-ism al-a^czam).¹ He continues: It is impossible that such a name is not mentioned in the Qur'ān. As God said: "Nothing have we omitted from the book" (VI-38). Thus He was not likely to deprive Muhammad and his nation from it while He favoured him above all Prophets and his nation above all nations. Al-Suhaylī then posed the question where is al-ism al-a^czam in the Qur'ān? The answer according to him is that: It is hidden in it in the same way as the hour of answering prayer is hidden in Friday, and laylat al-qadr in Ramadān. He speculated that when asking Ubayy the Prophet used the word a^czam (more glorious) and not afḍal (more meritorious) as an allusion to al-ism al-a^czam, since it is inconceivable to describe the verse as the most glorious while the most glorious name occurs in another. Hence it is more likely that the verse was thus described because the name occurs in it. This explained the reason why the Prophet complemented Ubay, who knew al-ism al-a^czam. To support his view al-Suhaylī quoted a tradition to the effect that Umm Salama asked the Prophet to reveal to her al-ism al-a^czam. He told her it is in these verses: "God! there is no God but He the living, the self subsisting, eternal" (II-255), and "Alif, lām, Mīm, God! there is no God but He the living the self subsisting eternal" (III-1-2).

1. The reference in the underlined God's saying: "The one who had knowledge of the book said" (XXVII-40), is believed to be to al-ism al-a^czam. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.19, p.163; al-Rāzī, vol.6, p.409; al-Kashshāf, vol.3, p.367; al-Ta^crīf, p.94.

Next al-Suhaylī quoted this verse: "He is the living (one) there is no God but He, call upon Him giving Him sincere devotion. Praise be to God, Lord of the worlds" (XL-65), commenting: In the beginning of it God disclosed for us His greatest name since after it He said: "call upon Him" which means call upon Him using that name, i.e. The living there is no God but He. Al-Suhaylī added that the end of the verse is a reminder for us to praise and thank Him for revealing to us His greatest name.¹

As is obvious from the tradition quoted above on the authority of Umm Salama and al-Suhaylī's comment on the above verse, that "Allāh the living the self-subsisting, eternal" could be understood as a reference to al-ism al-a^czam, nevertheless according to another tradition, the Prophet heard a man praying to God using names other than those mentioned; the Prophet remarked: He called upon God by al-ism al-a^czam. Al-Suhaylī who seemed well aware of this tradition, anticipated the contradiction; even so, he tried to explain it away saying: We did not say al-ism al-a^czam is "The living and the self-subsisting eternal", but these are two attributes very much connected with it and should be mentioned along with it. Similar are the names mentioned by the man to whom the Prophet referred, and other names such as dhū al-jalāl wa al-ikrām, i.e., Full of majesty, bounty and honour, and al-ahad, al-ṣamad, i.e. the One and Only. Moreover, some scholars held all the ninety-nine best names to be related to al-ism al-a^czam. Next, al-Suhaylī stated clearly that al-ism al-a^czam is Allāh, no God but He. Thus there will be one hundred best names, in accordance with the degrees of Heaven.² It occurred in a sound tradition that there are one hundred degrees in Paradise. The

1. Text, vol.1, p.205.

2. Ibid., p.206.

distance between every two degrees is like a distance of one hundred years walk.¹ Furthermore, our author tried to prove that al-ism al-a^czam is Allāh, saying: What proves it, is that you add all other names to it but you do not add it to them. For instance you say al-^cAzīz, i.e. The allmighty, is one of the names of Allāh, but you do not say Allāh is one of the names of al-^cAzīz.²

Al-Suhaylī then examined the word Allāh from the standpoint of its vocal properties and structure. As for the latter he noticed that although the letter lām should not be pronounced as emphatic mufakhkham unless with the letters of itbāq,³ even so, in this word the lām is pronounced as emphatic* while all the other names follow the rule. As for the structure al-Suhaylī also noticed that the word consists of alif, at the beginning, two lāms and a hā' at the end. You produce the initial sound at the front of the vocal tract, after vocalizing

-
1. Text, vol.1, p.206. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.9, p.383. . . . The version narrated by al-Bukhārī is slightly different; the distance between every two degrees was described as the distance between the sky and the earth. Al-Suhaylī adopted the reading of al-Tirmidhī, vol.4, p.674.
 2. Text, vol.1, p.207.
 3. Al-ḥurūf al-mutbaqa are ṣād, dād, ṭa and za. They are called thus for the part of the tongue, which is the place of their utterance being (closely) covered - when vocalized - by what is opposite to it of the palate, Lane, p.1827.
 4. It is pronounced from the lower part of the tongue (i.e. with the tongue turned up) such as in the word ball - Lane, p.2350.

the middle sound you return to the place of articulation of the first sound to make the final sound hā'. Thus the utterance corresponds to the meaning, since from God was the beginning and to Him is the return. Moreover the reproduction of creation is easier than the initial creation. Similar is the vocalization of the final sound, i.e. hā' is easier than the first sound, i.e. alif.

Our author then anticipated the question: If al-ism al-a^czam is Allāh, where then is the swiftness in answering? He provided two answers for this question. First this name was well preserved by those who knew it from previous nations, and held as glorious; no-one can touch it or vocalize it unless in a state of purity. Those who knew it behaved in a godly manner and their hearts were full with glorification and fear of God.¹ But when this name was exposed and people started using it in jest or telling lies, or not behaving in accord with its glory, they lost their respect for it. Thus its swiftness in answering ceased. To support this view he quoted a tradition where the Prophet Job said: Whenever I pass by two men arguing and mentioning the name of God, I go back to my house and make kaffāra (expiation) on their behalf as I hate mentioning the name of God in a non-righteous cause.² It is also reported on the authority of the Prophet that he said: "It is abhorrent to me to mention the name of God when I am not in a state of purity".³

The second answer provided by al-Suhaylī is that if the calling upon God was made earnestly from the heart and not

1. Text, vol.1, p.208.

2. Ibid., p.209.

3. Ibid.

from the tongue only, it is likely to be answered. However the answering of a prayer (du^ʿā') could be fulfilled in several forms; by granting what was requested, or by either reserving a reward or deflecting a potential mischief instead of granting what was asked for. The example given is when the Prophet prayed to God not to make the fighting spirit of his nation strong amongst themselves but this was denied him and he was given instead the intercession on the day of Judgement.¹

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq reported that more than eighty verses of sūrat Āl ʿImrān were revealed on the occasion of the coming of the deputation from the Christian of Najrān to meet the Prophet.²

Al-Suhaylī seized the opportunity to discuss some verses of the sūra. With regard to verse 7 dealing with muḥkam and mutashābih verses of the Qur'ān,³ he pointed out that the word muḥkam as used in this verse, "He it is who has sent down to thee the book: In it are āyātun muḥkamātun. They are the foundation of the book, others are allegorical" (III-7) is not derived from the word ḥikma (wisdom) or iḥkām (perfection). According to him it is from ḥakama (curb) as you say aḥkamtū al-farasa bi ḥakamatihi (lit. I curbed the horse with his curb), which means that you took control of the horse and prevented him from diverting from the road. In the same manner are those verses, not subject to different interpretations. They have only one restricted meaning;⁴ while

1. Text, vol.1, p.209. cf. Sunan al-Tirmidhī, vol.4, p.473.

2. Text, vol.5, p.11.

3. Ibid., p.28.

4. Ibid., p.30. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.3, pp.170-181; I^c rāb, vol.1, p.309.

the allegorical verses are subject to different ways of interpretation. Those who deviate follow what is allegorical and interpret it according to their desires to substantiate thereby what they have invented and introduce a new meaning so that they may have an argument for their opinions. But those grounded in knowledge carry out the interpretation of the allegorical according to the muḥkam. In this way they comply with God's saying: "If you differ in anything, refer it to God (i.e. the Qur'ān) and His Apostle (i.e. the tradition)" (IV-59). As it is one speech from one God, no contradiction is to be expected.¹ To emphasise his view, al-Suhaylī quoted a tradition on the authority of ʿĀ'isha to the effect that, after reciting the verse "But those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part thereof that is allegorical, seeking discord, and searching for its hidden meanings" (III-7), the Prophet said: "If you saw those who argue about it (the Qur'ān) know that it is they, whom God meant in this verse: So beware of them".²

Al-Suhaylī then extended the information to include commentators' opinions on the interpretation of the last part of the verse in question, "But no one knows its hidden meanings except God. And those who are firmly grounded in knowledge say: 'We believe in the book; the whole of it is from our Lord'" (III-7). Two different ways of reading this part of the verse were adopted by two different groups. One reading would not make a break after God's saying "Except God", but would run the two sentences together. In that case the construction would run: "No one knows its hidden meanings except God and

1. Text, vol.5, p.30. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.3, pp.170-181.

2. Text, vol.5, p.30. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.6, p.53, al-Ṭabarī, vol.3, pp.178-179.

those who are firmly grounded in knowledge". Accordingly they hold that the firm in knowledge know the hidden meanings of the Qur'ān. This reading was rejected by the majority of commentators, but accepted by Mujāhid¹ and others.² Another reading would make a break between the two sentences. They cited as a proof the reading of Ibn ^CAbbās "wa yaqūl al-rāsikhūn fi al-^Cilm" who already adopted the word "yaqūl" to make a break between the two sentences. Al-Suhaylī added that this was the opinion of ^CUmar ibn ^CAbd al-^CAzīz, i.e. that the firm in knowledge, although they know the interpretation (tafsīr) they do not know the ta'wīl (i.e. the way in which it is to be fulfilled). The meaning of the two words is completely different according to this group. The latter is in the same manner as God's saying, "yawm ya'ti ta'wīluhu" (VII-53), "On the day when its fulfilment comes".³ Our author, who adopted the explanation of Mujāhid of the meaning of muḥkam,⁴ rejected both views in this instance and explained his own saying: The most suitable explanation was that of Ibn Ishāq who would make a break between the two sentences. Nevertheless he did not hold that the firm in knowledge do not know the hidden meanings of the allegorical verses "mutashābih". Instead they know it but only by carrying out the interpretation of the obscure according to the muḥkam which can have only one meaning, and thus the book

-
1. Abū al-Ḥajjāj ibn Jabr, was described as the most knowledgeable man of his time in the exegesis of the Qur'ān. Ibn ^CAbbās was his eminent teacher. He died at the age of 83 in the year 103 A.H. cf. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.92.
 2. Text, vol.5, pp.31, 32. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.3, p.183.
 3. Ibid.
 4. See above cf. al-Ṭabarī, op. cit.

becomes consistent, one part confirming another, the argument effective and the case clear; falsehood is excluded and disbelief is overcome. That is why the status of those firm in knowledge is so high in God's sight.¹

Al-Suhaylī then explained the reason why he would not run the two sentences together. He said it is improper to do so, because God's knowledge of the hidden meanings is different from that of those firm in knowledge. God knows it by His eternal knowledge without need of remembrance, reflection, examining closely or searching for proofs. Whilst the latter know it only by employing all these ways of gaining knowledge. Hence God concluded the verse, "And none will grasp the message except men of understanding"² (III-7).

He cited as an example of following the allegorical and interpreting it according to desires, the argument presented by the deputation from the Christians of Najran.³ They argue that God is the third of three as He says: We have done, We have commanded, We have created and We have decreed, and they say, If He were one He would have said I have done, I have created and so on, but He is He and Jesus and Mary. Our author finds it most extraordinary that they challenged the Prophet with what was revealed to the Prophet, who was certainly the most knowledgeable of all, ~~since~~ such verses should be understood in the light of the muḥkam ones such as "And your God is one God there is no God but He" (II-163) and "Say He is God, the one and only" (CXII-1).

1. Text, vol.5, p.23. cf. p.12.

2. Ibid., p.32.

3. Ibid., p.11.

He then explained that it is metaphorical to say "We" instead of "I" as it is originally used in kings' letters. The use of the plural is to indicate that the message is from someone who is in command and who has followers obedient to him. Thus when addressing the Arabs God used the same style they used.¹ Even so, it should not be thought that the plural was used in God's eternal speech (in the preserved Tablet). This probably explains the reason why the plural was not used when God informed us of His sayings to previous Prophets or people other than Arabs. To promote this view al-Suhaylī made a comparison between verses addressing the Arabs and others addressing previous Prophets or people. In the second type he instanced the verse "What prevents you from prostrating yourself to one whom I have created with my own hands" (XXXVIII-75). As the address was not to the Arabs the plural was not used whilst in another verse addressing the Arabs it occurs: "See they not that it is We who have created for them - among the things which our hands have fashioned² - cattle, which are under their dominion" (XXXVI-71). Our author also instanced another verse when God was informing us about what He said to Moses: "In order that you may be reared under my eye" (XX-39); thus the plural was not used whereas in God's saying "She floats under our eyes" (LIV-14) the plural was used as it is a report, while in the former verse Moses was directly addressed.³

1. Text, vol.5, p.33.

2. Instead of "amilat aydīna", the reading "amilathu aydīna" appears in the text of al-Rawḍ. It is likely to be a misrepresentation as no such reading occurs in the Qur'ān, but only "amilat aydīna" (XXXVI-71) and "amilathu aydīhum" (XXXVI-35); Text, vol.5, p.33.

3. Text, vol.5, pp.33-34.

In fact al-Suhayli has no grounds for such speculations. On several occasions in revelations concerning previous Prophets the plural was used. For instance when God is repeating what He said to Moses: "Seize it and fear not: We shall return it to its former condition" (XX-21), or "In order that We may show you" (XX-23), or "Indeed We conferred a favour on you" (XX-37). Likewise when addressing Noah God said: "But construct an Ark under our eyes and our inspiration" (XI-37), or "So We inspired him 'Construct the Ark within our sight and our guidance" (XXXIII-27).

Al-Suhaylī also seized the opportunity to point out that: It is improper to address God using the plural pronoun such as saying: "forgive me" "aghfirū lī", or "have mercy on me" "arḥamūnī". It is recorded nowhere that a Prophet used such a form in praying to God. He then suggested two reasons: firstly, that it is incumbent on a believer to feel the unity of God at all times, so his words should be in conformity with his beliefs. Secondly, as was mentioned earlier, it is metaphorical for a king to use the plural when referring to himself while addressing his subjects in accordance with Arabic speech.¹

However the second suggestion is contradicted by the fact that the Arabs also use the plural metaphorically when speaking to a king, but the first reason seems more appropriate. Al-Suhaylī seemingly anticipated the question: If it is improper to address God in the plural why has it occurred in the Qur'ān? "(In falsehood will they be Until, when death comes to one of them, he says: 'O my lord! send me back' (to life)" (XXIII-99). The verb for "send me back"

1. Text, vol.5, p.33.

is in the plural in Arabic. Al-Suhaylī then answered this saying: It occurred in the context of a disbeliever who at the time when the angels of death approached him would make such a prayer in his custom of associating others with God in life. But he connected the meaning of this verse with the previous one (XXIII-98). Apparently the two verses are not connected. The pronoun in verse 98 refers to the Prophet and could include all the believers who were commanded to seek refuge with God from the suggestions of evil ones or their coming nearer, whereas in verse 99 a non-believer was meant. The most likely explanation is that of al-Ṭabarī, who suggested that at the time of death a disbeliever would say "arjī^c ūni" addressing the angels of death on seeing them approaching him. Nevertheless, al-Ṭabarī did not connect the two verses.¹

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī also explained verse 36, "When she was delivered she said: 'O my Lord! Behold! I am delivered of a female Child!' And God knew best what she brought forth 'And nowise is the male like the female'" (III-36). With regard to the last statement, he said it is an allusion to the fact that a female cannot serve the temple all the time because of the periods of menstruation, whilst a male can serve all the time.² However according to Yusuf Ali, a female could not be devoted to temple service under the Mosaic Law.³ Al-Suhaylī added that, according to proper usage, the rule applying to the verb laysa⁴ in such a case is that the inferior should come first.

1. Tafsīr, vol.18, p.52.

2. Text, vol.5, p.37.

3. Cf. Commentary (III-36); Ahkām, vol.1, pp.270-71.

4. The majority of lexicographers were of the opinion that "laysa" is a verb, while according to Abū Bakr ibn al-Sarrāj and al-Fārisī it is a particle (ḥarf). cf. Ibn ^cAqīl, vol.1, pp.227-228.

Thus it should have been "And nowise is the female like the male". He then provides the answer saying a female is only inferior to the male in the sight of man, who considers wealth and sons the allurements of this world. However, in God's sight a female is more meritorious. Hence God mentioned females first when referring to (children) as He said: "He bestows (children) female or male According to His will" (XLII-49). Our author also quoted a tradition to the effect that the Prophet commanded Muslims to start with females when showing mercy or sympathy. It was also reported that the Prophet said: "Whoever brought up two girls properly till they grew up, he and I would come (together) (very closely) on the Day of Resurrection."¹

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

Pertaining to the same sūra, al-Suhaylī commented also on verse 59. First he pointed out an anecdote in God's saying, "The similitude of Jesus before God is as that of Ādam; He created him from dust then said to him: 'Be' and he is" (III-59). According to him it is significant to use the present tense here, i.e. yakūn, instead of the past. The reason is that the particle fā serves the purpose of consequence and cause; thus if the past tense had been used the fā would have served only the purpose of indicating the cause, in the sense that the word "Be" was the cause of the "existence". However, using the present tense after fā gives both meaning, i.e. consequence and cause.² This explanation seems to have raised another question for our author as he rectified this saying: But the fā here indicates that the action takes place soon after the divine command, whereas it was reported that Ādam remained in the form of clay for a long period of time.³

1. Text, vol.5, p.37. cf. Muslim, vol.4, p.1384.

2. Text, vol.5, p.28.

3. Cf. al-Tabarī, vol.29, p.202; al-Anbiyā', p.45.

Moreover the creation of the Heavens and earth was accomplished in six days, which is equal to six thousand years.¹ He then provided the answer that the divine command "Be" could be confined to a definite time or not. Hence if God says of a thing "'Be' in a thousand years", it would be in a thousand years, or if unrestricted it would be in no time.²

However, this seems to be a spontaneous suggestion by al-Suhaylī who has a long discussion on the creation of the world in six days, in which he made no reference to either opinion, i.e. Ādam remained in clay for a long period, or the creation of the Heavens and earth in six thousand years.³ The latter claim is apparently an interpretation of a Qur'ānic verse: "Verily a day in the sight of Thy Lord is like a thousand years of your reckoning" (XXII-47). However, according to al-Ṭabarī this verse should not be understood literally, as it occurred in the discourse of the unbelievers' challenge to the Prophet to hasten the punishment, but God's aim was to emphasise that time with Him is nothing and He will not fail in His promise of respite because He is the most forbearing. And what we call a thousand years in our calculations may be nothing more than a day to Him.*

* * * * *

With regard to the reasons of revelation, al-Suhaylī mentioned that when Negus died, the Prophet made an announcement to everyone on that day, and went out with them

1. Text, vol.5, p.29.

2. Ibid.

3. See pp.112-116 above.

4. Cf. Tafsīr, vol.17, p.184 ; Ibn Kathir, vol.3, p.229.

to the cemetery of al-Baqī^C. Negus's bier was raised up so that he might see it in Medina and pray over it. The hypocrites were astonished by that act (i.e. praying over a non-Muslim). Concerning this God revealed, "And there are, certainly, among the people of the book, those who believe in God, in the revelation to you, and in the revelation to them, bowing in humility to God. They will not sell the signs of God for a miserable gain! For them is a reward with their Lord, and God is swift in account" (III-199).¹

Although al-Tabarī preserved this account on the authority of Qatāda,² he finally rejected it, saying that the authority was questionable.³ He held the verse above mentioned to have been revealed concerning all the people of the book, Jews or Christians, whose description meets that stated in the verse.⁴ This exegesis was attributed to Mujāhid.⁵ Both Ibn Ishāq⁶ and al-Tabarī did not mention the raising of the bier.

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq made a short reference to Labīd ibn al-A^Cṣam;

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.262.
 2. Abū al-Khattāb ibn Di^Cāma, was described as the most knowledgeable traditionist in Baṣra at his time. He transmitted traditions on the authority of Anas ibn Mālik and Sa^Cīd ibn al-Musayyab. He died at the age of fifty-seven in the year 117 A.H. See Tadhkira, vol.1, pp.123-24.
 3. Tafsīr, vol.4, pp.218-220.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Text, vol.3, p.252.

he then said: He was the Jew who bewitched the Prophet.¹ Indicating his source as jāmi^C of Ma^Cmar ibn Rāshid, al-Suhaylī asserted that the spell lasted for a whole year. He regarded the tradition as sound and he accepted it saying that it did not contradict naql (traditions) or caql (reason). He goes on to say: Prophets are only inviolable in their minds and conviction, otherwise they are not preserved from bodily afflictions. Thus they are subject to being injured, beaten, poisoned or even murdered. This is the opinion of the majority except the Mu^Ctazila,² and it was fully discussed by another Andalusian scholar, al-Qādī^C Iyād (476-544),³ who was considerably older than our author. However al-Suhaylī did not refer to him, although his arguments were meant to be a response to the Mu^Ctazila, who rejected the tradition in question on the grounds that Prophets could not be bewitched. Because if they are vulnerable to being bewitched then they are vulnerable to being insane too. With regard to the Prophet they used as a proof the verse, "And God will protect you from men" (V-71). Referring to this verse, al-Suhaylī considered its relevance was exclusively to the bodily afflictions.⁴ However it remains unclear how our author categorizes the illness of the Prophet which he described saying, "the spell lasted for a whole year when the Prophet imagined doing things which he did not do".⁵ In other words he admitted that the Prophet was

1. Text, vol.4, p.307.

2. Ibid., p.399. cf. al-Uṣūl, p.575; al-Rāzī, vol.1, p.302; vol.3, p.431.

3. See al-Shifā', vol.4, pp.248-254. cf. p.245 below.

4. Text, vol.4, p.399. cf. al-Rāzī, vol.3, p.431.

5. Text, vol.4, p.399. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.4, p.317.

confused. Thus al-Suhaylī seemed to have contradicted himself as confusion was merely a disorder in mind which he has already denied. Similar to this opinion was that of Ibn al-Qayyim who admitted the nature of the Prophet's illness as quoted above, nevertheless he endeavoured to assert that it was a bodily affliction.¹ The Mu^Ctazila must have been well aware of the contradiction between this tradition and the verse above quoted (V-71) and they were justified in rejecting it.

* * * * *

Although not actually referring to the Qur'ān, al-Suhaylī is in fact very concerned about the interpretation of the meaning of the word ummī as attributed to the Prophet which occurs in two verses of Sūrat al-A^C rāf (VII-157-158). The general interpretation, though not universal, is that this word means illiterate. Thus problems arise concerning the affair of Hudaybiyya, where it occurred that the Prophet erased his name Rasūl Allāh and wrote Muhammad Ibn ^CAbd Allāh instead.² However in the Sīra of Ibn Hishām there is no mention of the Prophet writing his name.³ Thus it seems likely that al-Suhaylī was using another version, probably Yunūs. He commented saying: Some people, on account of this thought that the Prophet wrote with his own hand, and it also occurred in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī that the Prophet wrote but he did not write well.* Some people speculated that God caused the Prophet to write at that moment as a miracle. Al-Suhaylī vigorously attacked those who held this opinion without naming them. He

1. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.3, pp.104-105.

2. Text, vol.6, p.485.

3. Ibid., p.462.

4. Ibid., p.485. cf. Ta'rikh, vol.2, p.636, Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.4, p.273.

said: It would certainly have been a miracle had it not been contradictory to another miracle - that of the Prophet's being an illiterate, living in an illiterate nation, and this natural condition of his was one of his miraculous signs. With that stands the proof of his Prophecy; with it, the non-believer is made silent and such a fact leaves no doubt whatsoever. How could it then be believed that God caused him to write to make it a miracle, since the miracle was his not being able to write, and miracles do not contradict each other. He then explained away the literal meaning of the tradition in question saying: The meaning of kataba then is "commanded to write".¹

Our author was probably alluding to Abū al-Walīd al-Bājī (d.474), an Andalusian scholar,² who took the surface meaning of the tradition narrated by al-Bukhārī and al-Ṭabarī. He was of the opinion that the Prophet learned writing afterwards as a miracle without being taught, while he did not know how to write before the revelation of the Qur'ān. The Andalusian scholars at the time charged him with apostasy and accused him of zandaqa. He defended himself by quoting as a proof the verse, "Thou didst not read, before it, from a book, not didst thou write it with thy right hand" (XXIX-48). On account of the expression "Before it", he argued that the verse confined the Prophet's inability to read and write to the time prior to his mission and that the Prophet became acquainted with writing after he had been unacquainted therewith.³ As has

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.485, cf. al-Ta^crīf, pp.39-40.
 2. Sulaymān ibn Khalaf, known to the west as Avempace, was a theologian, Qur'ān commentator and a jurist. He was a native from Cordoba. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1178. Cf. Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn, vol.1, p.202.
 3. Al-Mawāhib, vol.2, p.196. cf. Tadhkira, vol.3, p.1181. Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn, vol.1, pp.205, 206.

been mentioned our author would have none of that.

One of al-Suhaylī's arguments is that the Prophet was an illiterate ummī and he explained it as: One who does not write. According to other scholars the word should be applied to anyone not knowing the art of writing nor that of reading.¹ However, al-Bayḍāwī, in his commentary on the Qur'ān, following al-Zamkhsharī's opinion,² explained the word ummī as one not having a revealed scripture and particularly an Arab.³

After reviewing eastern and western scholars' opinions on the meaning of the word ummī, Dr. Jawād Alī concluded that the word is used to represent someone who does not have a revealed scripture. According to him, explaining the word as "illiterate" was only a misinterpretation of a verse in the Qur'ān (II-78).⁴

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

Ibn Ishāq mentioned that Sūrat al-Anfāl was revealed concerning Badr. Al-Suhaylī quoted a verse of poetry to elucidate the meaning of the word anfāl, "Booty". Though he agreed with Abū ʿUbayd in the meaning he provided for it, he

-
1. Ibn Manẓūr, vol.14, pp.299-300.
 2. Although al-Zamakhsharī explained the word ummiyyīn as those not having a revealed scripture, i.e. the polytheists of the Arabs, he avoided explaining the word ummī as attributed to the Prophet in verses 157, 158 of Sūrat al-ʿArāf; al-Kashshāf, vol.1, pp.247, 375; cf. vol.2, pp.165, 167.
 3. Vol.2, p.10, cf. al-Kashshāf, vol.1, pp.247, 375.
 4. Al-Mufaṣṣal, vol.8, p.105.

did not agree with him as to the reason why it was so called. He said: Anfāl means excess since it increases the possessions of those who gain it, but the use of the word has no link with Islam as Abū ^cUbayd tried to illustrate the meaning saying that it was so called because God made it lawful to the Prophet and his Companions.¹ Al-Suhaylī quoted a verse from Aws ibn Hajar, who lived in the era prior to Islam, to emphasise his view that the derivation of the word was from the word (nafl) (excess). He also pointed out that there was evidence in the verse he cited for the ancient use of the word (khamīs) army. As some people alleged - to use his own expression - that the name khamīs was derived from khums,² that refers to the division of Booty in Islam.

* * * * *

Pertaining to the same sūra, indicating his source as Ibn Ishāq but not through Ibn Hishām's version, probably Yūnus, al-Suhaylī quoted a description of the fight of the angels on the side of the believers at the Battle of Badr; the angels were in the form of men. They gave firmness to the believers by saying, "The number of your enemy is very small and God is with you..." and similar such expressions. He also quoted that the believers used to distinguish the ones whom they had killed from those who were killed by the angels by black marks on their necks and fingertips.³ Referring to the verse, "Remember ye implored the assistance of your lord, and he answered you: I will assist you with a thousand of the angels" (VIII-9), al-Suhaylī said: those were the thousand who fought with the

-
1. Text, vol.5, p.225, al-Amwāl, p.386, cf. Aḥkām, p.835.
 2. Text, vol.5, p.225.
 3. Ibid., p.232.

believers.¹ Thus al-Suhaylī seems to hold the view of those who believe that the angels did fight with the Muslims on the day of Badr. Although it was a matter of dispute, he did not mention any different views.

The dispute came concerning the interpretation of this verse: "Remember Thy Lord inspired the angels (with the message): I am with you. Give firmness to the believers. I will instil terror into the hearts of the unbelievers. Smite ye above their necks and smite all their fingertips off them" (VIII-12).² Some scholars hold that the message that God gave to the angels was only the first part of the verse mentioned, i.e. "I am with you: Give firmness to the believers".³ According to them the rest of the verse was a new sentence addressing the believers themselves. Whereas those who hold the whole verse to be the message like Ibn Ishāq consider the reference in "smite ye" to be to the angels. However, another scholar has endeavoured to refute this latter view, saying that from the books of tradition we know not only the names of those who died at Badr, but also the names of those who killed them. Thus enforcing the belief that the angels fought with the Muslims at the Battle of Badr after all the means of victory that God provided to them, merely upgrades the importance and courage of the unbelievers, as it implied that the Muslims with all their spiritual and material power could not kill seventy and capture another seventy of their enemies without the help of a thousand or more of the angels. If this were so then what was the merit of them that made the Prophet say to ^cUmar "How can you tell perhaps God has looked at those who fought at Badr and said "Do whatever you like I have forgiven you."⁴

1. Text, vol.5, p.232.

2. Cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.9, pp.193-199.

3. Al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., p.197; al-Kashshāf, vol.2, pp.204-205; cf. al-Rāzī, vol.4, p.357.

4. Tafsīr al-Manār, vol.9, pp.613-14. See further Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.5, p.214.

Unfortunately, it is nowhere recorded that before the battle, the believers were commanded to smite the necks and fingertips of the polytheists. Thus the opinion of Ibn Ishāq and our author seems to be the more likely. Because if the address was to the believers, they should have heard it before the battle.

* * * * *

With regard to verse 108 of Sūrat al-Tawba (IX) al-Suhaylī extended the material on the foundation of the Mosque of Qubā'.¹ It was reported that the Prophet on his way to Medina stayed in Qubā' among the Banū ^CAmr ibn ^CAwf from Monday to Thursday and then he laid the foundation of Qubā's Mosque.² Al-Suhaylī quoted Ibn Abī Khaythma, who said: The Prophet was the first to put a stone in the direction of the qibla in the foundation of Qubā's Mosque, Abū Bakr put the second stone and ^CUmar put the third stone beside Abū Bakr's. The people then continued the building.³ Our author seems not to have examined this material as it is well known that ^CUmar did not emigrate with the Prophet. He also quoted another tradition to the effect that the Prophet used to carry heavy stones no other man could carry.⁴ He then added: It was the first Mosque to be built in Islām, and concerning it God revealed: "In it are men who love to be purified" (IX-108). Thus it was the Mosque that was founded on piety. Al-Suhaylī here was referring to the first part of the above-quoted verse, "There is a mosque whose foundation was laid from the first day on piety" (IX-108). However, he quoted another opinion that the reference was to the Prophet's mosque

-
1. Qubā' is a suburb of Medina, about three miles to the south east. cf. Mu^Cjam, vol.3, pp.1045-6.
 2. Text, vol.4, p.232.
 3. Ibid., p.254.
 4. Ibid.

in Medina,¹ then commented: Although both mosques were founded on piety, the reference was likely to be to Qubā's mosque, as God says "from the first day", and the foundation of the latter was on the first day of the arrival of the Prophet at Medina for hijra.²

Although his opinion is probably correct as regards which mosque is being referred to, the argument which he presented as a proof is based on a misinterpretation of the Qur'ānic verse, because the reference in God's saying "from the first day" is to the founding of the mosque³ and not the Prophet's arrival in Medina. A more logical explanation is that a contrast between the two mosques: one founded on piety, the other on mischievousness,⁴ was intended (of these two mosques, which were both situated together, i.e. in Qubā', praying in the latter was forbidden for the Prophet). As further proof, it is recorded by al-Ṭabarī and elsewhere that when this verse was revealed, i.e. "In it are men who love to purify themselves" (IX-108), the Prophet asked the people of Qubā' about the purification that God revealed concerning them. They told him that they used to purify themselves with water (when they came from offices of nature⁵). However, the reference was also likely to be to a spiritual purification.

Furthermore al-Suhaylī, relying on the misinterpretation of the verse above mentioned, endeavoured to prove that this verse was the origin of the Muslims' consensus to start dating the Muslim era with the year of hijra, as it was the year of

1. Text, vol.4, p.255. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.11, p.26.

2. Text, vol.4, p.255.

3. Al-Ṭabarī, op. cit. Aḥkām, vol.2, p.1015.

4. It was reported that some hypocrites of the tribe of Banū Ghanam built an opposition mosque in Qubā'. Ṭabarī, op. cit.

5. Al-Ṭabarī, op. cit. cf. Text, vol.4, p.255.

the power of Islam, when the Prophet had authority, founded mosques, and worshipped God openly in security. He added that if the Companions of the Prophet had based their decision on this verse, that is to be expected from them, because they were the most learned in the book of God and its exegesis. But if it was according to their own opinion, it could be said that God knew of it before it happened and approved of it. As it is impossible to say: "I did this from the first day" with nothing added to explain "first day of what"; it has to be added rather, to a known year or month. Thus the significance of mentioning the first day here is to indicate that it is the first day of the Muslim era (lit. dating).¹

Ibn Hajar quoted al-Suhaylī in connection with this, then commented saying: At first sight "the first day" seemed to be a reference to the arrival of the Prophet at Medina.² Thus he seems to agree with al-Suhaylī in his argument above quoted with regard to the reference to Qubā's mosque in the verse 108,³ whilst another scholar rejected our author's view, describing it as based on arbitrary use of language. He added that the predecessors considered it to mean "from the first day of the foundation", as the Arabic language necessitates this meaning.⁴ Ibn al-^CArabi was of this latter opinion.

However, opinions differ as regards the decision to start the Muslim era from the year of hijra. The most likely version relates that: Abū Mūsā al-Ash^Carī wrote to ^CUmar drawing his attention to the letters he received with no date shown on them. Thereupon ^CUmar gathered the people and asked their opinion. Some suggested the Mab^Cath, and others the hijra. ^CUmar said: "The hijra divided truth and falsehood, so (let

1. Text, vol.4, pp.254-257.

2. Al-Fath, vol.7, p.214.

3. Ibid.

4. Sharḥ al-Mawāhib, vol.1, p.352.

5. Aḥkam, vol.2, p.1015.

us) make a decision in favour of it, and start with al-Muharram, because it is the time of the departure from the pilgrimage. The people agreed. It was said that was during the sixteenth or seventeenth year of hijra in Rabī^C the first.¹

* * * * *

Alluding to verse 111 of the same sūra, al-Suhaylī made some speculations about the tradition previously referred to, involving the Prophet's purchase of Jābir's camel.² He said it is well known that the Prophet never did anything ineffectual. His actions were always inspired by his wisdom and supported by his impeccability. Thus it could be asked why did he buy the camel from Jābir, pay him the price and extra payment too, but eventually return to him his camel?³

Our author answered this question, saying that the Prophet could have given Jābir money or whatever he liked without buying the camel, but the whole transaction has a particular significance.⁴ According to al-Suhaylī, it was a reference to the conversation that had taken place shortly before the transaction between Jābir and the Prophet, in which it was mentioned that Jābir's father died as a martyr during the battle of Uhūd.⁵ The Prophet told Jābir that God gave life to his father and rewarded him with extra payment. Hence he used the transaction involving the camel as a parable to elucidate and emphasise what he said to Jābir. He bought from him his camel which was his mount and the souls of men are their mounts too, as it was reported that ^CUmar ibn ^CAbd al-^CAzīz said, "My soul is my mount".⁶ That was a parable for

-
1. Al-Fath, vol.7, p.214. cf. Sharḥ al-Mawāhib, vol.1, p.352.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.248, cf. p.161 above.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Cf. p.161 above.
 5. Text, vol.6, p.248.
 6. Ibid., p.249.

God buying from Jābir's father and all the martyrs their souls and promising them paradise in return. Here al-Suhaylī was alluding to the verse, "God hath purchased of the believers their souls and their wealth; for theirs (in return) is the garden (of paradise). They fight in his cause, and slay and are slain. A promise binding on Him in Truth, through the law, the Gospel, and the Qur'ān. And who is more faithful to his covenant than God? Then rejoice in the bargain which ye have concluded: That is the achievement supreme" (IX-111).

Our author goes on to say. The Prophet gave Jābir extra payment as God gives the believers extra reward. He supported this by quoting the verse, "To those who do right there is a goodly (reward) Yea, more (than in measure)" (X-26). Al-Suhaylī added that the return of the camel to Jābir signifies the return of the souls to the martyrs. As God revealed, "Think not of those who are slain in God's way as dead. Nay, they live finding their sustenance in the presence of their Lord"¹ (III-169).

Ibn Kathīr and others, who described al-Suhaylī saying that he pointed out unprecedented anecdotes in the Sīra,² were probably having in mind our author's comment on this tradition and its like.

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

With regard to verse 59 of Sūrat al-Isrā' (XVII) concerning the nonbelievers when they asked the Prophet to bring them signs, such as the removal of the mountains or coming of angels, etc.,³ al-Suhaylī commented: Asking these things was due to their ignorance of the wisdom of God in sending Apostles; it was a trial for them to believe. God's

1. Text, vol.6, p.249.

2. Al-Bidāya, vol.12, p.318. cf. Tadhkira, vol.4, p.1348.

3. Text, vol.3, p.124.

wisdom demands that their faith be derived from their own reflection in the proofs and signs of this world, and that is why there is a reward. But at the time of the unveiling, when everything becomes obvious and they acquire the necessary knowledge, no punishment or reward is due. Because man is not to be rewarded for something which is not his own acquisition in the same way as he is not rewarded for the way he was created, his colour or his hair, etc. It is certainly possible that God could have commanded people to worship him by a direct and audible command instead of sending Apostles, but his Wisdom demanded that the matter be divided between this world and the world to come.¹ Thus in this world faith is based on reasoning, inference, reflection and considering examples, for it is a place of worship and trial.² In the world to come, however, faith would be replaced with necessary knowledge, which does not entail reward, for reward or punishment is based on what actions preceded in this world. God says, "And we refrain from sending the signs, only because the people of former generations treated them as false" (XVII-59). The commentators explained this verse saying: The falsification of clear signs such as the removal of mountains or sending down of angels necessitates the hastening of punishment in this world, as for example what happened to the people of Ṣāliḥ, i.e. Thamūd and the people of Pharoah.³ Hence if the Quraysh were granted what they asked for and falsified it, punishment would be inevitable. But God honoured Muḥammad and out of mercy sent him for all mankind, righteous or wicked. As for the righteous they experience His mercy in this world and in the world to come, but the wicked delude themselves that God will not cause them to be swallowed by the earth or by water or drop stones upon them from above. Thus said commentators on the verse "We send thee not, but as

1. Text, vol.3, pp.152-153.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.15, p.107.

a mercy for all creatures" (XXI-107).¹

Al-Suhaylī then concluded: Although they asked him to bring these signs which they mentioned, their intention was not to remove doubts but only to mock, because if they wanted proof the signs of Prophecy were sufficient for anyone who was earnestly seeking after the truth. God says, "Surely it should be enough for them that we have sent down to thee the book" (XXIX-51). He then quoted a tradition from Ibn Ishāq which he described as not being in this version, i.e. of Ibn Hishām, to the effect that when the Quraysh asked the Prophet to transform the mountain, al-Ṣafā into gold, Gabriel came to him with options, either to do it and, after that, should they not believe they would receive certain punishment, or else not to do it. Thereupon they said: "We do not want it".²

However, it is al-Ghazālī before our author who pressed for the necessity of reflection in this world as it is a place of worship and trial. Al-Suhaylī also used a favourite term used by the Ṣufī, that is kashf al-ghīṭā' (unveiling).³

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī preserved an interesting account which he preserved from Yūnus' version. It was concerning the reason for the sending down of the verses 76-80 of Sūrat al-Isrā' (XVII), after the sūra was concluded to use his own words. He said: The Jews in Medina came to the Prophet and challenged

1. Text, vol.3, p.153.

2. Ibid., p.154. According to both Yūnus and al-Ṭabarī this tradition is slightly different as both narrated that it is the Prophet himself who refrained from accepting such signs. cf. Yūnus, p.190, pas.272; Tafsīr, vol.15, p.108. See Abū Nu^caym, pp.236-7.

3. Text, vol.3, p.152.

him saying: "If you are a real Prophet as you allege, go and settle in al-Shām. Because it is the Land of Resurrection ard al-mahshar, and it is the Land of all Previous Prophets".¹ The Prophet believed what they said. So he invaded Tabūk and wanted nothing but al-Shām.² When he reached Tabūk this verse was revealed to him, "Their purpose was to scare you off the land, in order to expel you; but in that case they would not have stayed (therein) after you except for a little. (This was our) way with the Apostles We sent before thee thou wilt find no change in our ways" (XVII-76-77). He was ordered to go back to Medina where he was promised to live and die and to be resurrected. Another two verses were revealed, 78-79 of the same sūra. The Prophet then returned to Medina. Gabriel came to him and said: Ask your Lord whatever you like as every Prophet has a request to make. Al-Suhaylī added: Gabriel was always advising the Prophet who was very obedient to him. He asked him what do you advise me to ask? Gabriel said: "Say: 'O my Lord! let my entry be by the gate of truth and honour, and likewise my exit by the gate of truth and honour. And grant me from thy presence an authority to aid (me)'" (XVII-80). Al-Suhaylī rectified this, saying this verse was revealed to him on his way back from Tabūk.³

Unfortunately, this account is not available in the existing edition of Yūnus. It is worth noting that al-Suhaylī stated that this account was not on Ibn Ishāq's authority.⁴ Ibn Kathīr questioned the authorities on which it was handed down describing the whole tradition as inauthentic.⁵ He added

-
1. Text, vol.7, p.359. of. al-Ṭabarī, vol.15, p.132; Ibn Kathīr, vol.3, p.54.
 2. Text, vol.7, p.359. of. Ibn Kathīr, op. cit.
 3. Text, vol.7, p.360.
 4. Ibid., p.359.
 5. Ibn Kathīr quoted the account of Yūnus via al-Bayhaqī. The former had it from ^cAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām from Shahr ibn Hawshab from ^cAbd al-Rahmān ibn Ghanam. See Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr, vol.3, p.54.

that the Prophet invaded Tabūk in the fulfilment of this verse, "O ye believers fight those who are next to you from the non-believers" (IX-123), and this verse, "Fight those who do not believe in God or the last day and they do not hold as unlawful what God and his Apostle made unlawful"¹ (IX-29). However al-Ṭabarī, who preserved different views concerning the reason for the sending down of these verses, preserved as one of the reasons the challenge of the Jews of Medina to the Prophet.² Nevertheless he was of the opinion of Mujāhid, namely that those who wanted to scare the Prophet off the land were the Meccans and the land was Mecca itself.³ He used as proof the reference to the Meccans in the preceding verse while the Jews were not mentioned. As from the standpoint of language one cannot refer the pronoun to something which is not mentioned without an appropriate context.

* * * * *

With regard to the reason of the revelation of Sūrat al-Kahf (XVIII), Ibn Ishāq reported that the Jewish rabbis in Medina advised the Meccans to ask the Prophet about three things: One of them was to ask him what had happened to the young men who had disappeared in ancient days.⁴ On this point al-Suhaylī explained some verses of the Qur'ān belonging to this sūra.⁵

Concerning the verse "We drew a 'veil' over their ears" (XVIII-11), he said it means "we caused them to sleep" and it is said of a sleeping person that "a veil is drawn over his

1. Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr, vol.3, p.54.

2. Tafsīr Al-Ṭabarī, vol.15, p.132.

3. Ibid., p.133; Tafsīr Mujāhid, vol.1, p.367.

4. Text, vol.3, p.128. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.15, p.191; al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.461.

5. Text, vol.3, p.161.

ears", because a sleeping person cannot be awakened except by means of hearing. The Arabic word "darb" is used here figuratively, as it is originally from ḍarabtu, i.e. I fixed for instance "a lock on the door".¹

Al-Suhaylī then quoted another verse, "Thou wouldst have seen the sun, when it rose, declining to the right from their cave, and when it set, turning away from them to the left, while they lay in the open space in the midst of the cave" (17). After explaining some of the words in this verse, al-Suhaylī asked what the significance of all these details was. He came to the conclusion that: God meant that they were lying in the open space of the cave, where the heat of the sun could not reach; had this not been the case their clothes would have worn out. They were also turned on their right and on their left sides lest they be consumed by the earth. Most important, according to al-Suhaylī, are those details about their position and that of their dog too (verse 18), because if someone had seen them he would certainly have been filled with terror and would not have had the ability to grasp all these details.² Furthermore the Prophet had neither seen them nor heard of them before, nor could he have read about them in a book as it is well known that he was an illiterate living amongst illiterates. Nevertheless he informed us of all these details, even their dog which was stretching forth his two fore-legs, and its place in the cave was mentioned. In all this there is certainly a convincing proof of his prophethood and his sincerity, nor was he an imposter as they alleged. Al-Suhaylī then advised the reader to consider this point seriously, because the heretics treated this verse as frivolous.³

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.161. cf. al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., p.205; al-Rāzī, op. cit., p.462. cf. Ibn Manzūr, vol.2, p.38.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.161 seq. cf. al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., pp.210-215; al-Rāzī, op. cit., pp.472-473.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.166.

He then speculated that the turning of the bodies was done by angels. Thus the dog was not included; nevertheless his body was not consumed by the earth. He added that angels are the friends of the believers both in this world and in the world to come. However, they do not enter a house where there is a picture or a dog, and for this reason the dog was described as standing at the threshold not with them inside the cave. Apparently al-Suhaylī based his argument on mere hypotheses; first he speculated that their bodies were turned lest the earth consume them, whilst at the same time ignoring the fact that the dog was not included in the turning, but nevertheless survived. One might ask why the bodies of the believers needed to be turned in order to survive whilst that of the dog did not. But al-Suhaylī seemed to have forgotten the view that God, who is capable of making their bodies endure for more than three hundred years, is also capable of preserving the bodies without its being necessary to keep turning them.¹

However, although these details were significant, the story as a whole is far more important. In the sura itself people were commanded to learn the lesson from it (i.e. the reality of the Resurrection) rather than to fall into controversies about these details.

* * * * *

In the account of the ascent to heaven, Ibn Ishāq narrated that in the fourth heaven the Prophet met Idrīs, with regard to whom God revealed "And we raised him to a lofty station" (XIX-57).²

Al-Suhaylī asked why Idrīs was described thus, even

1. Cf. al-Rāzī, vol.5, p.473.

2. Text, vol.3, p.443.

though the Prophet saw Moses and Abraham in a higher place. He answered with not a little caution that it was reported on the authority of Ka^cb al-Ahbār that Idrīs was favoured by being taken up to the fourth heaven alive, without passing through the gates of death. He was taken up by an angel to whom the sun is entrusted and who was also a friend of his. Idrīs asked the angel to show him heaven and God permitted the angel to do so. When they reached the fourth heaven, the angel of death saw Idrīs and he was amazed to be ordered to take his soul on that heaven, but he did.¹

This story was also narrated by Ibn Kathīr but he rejected it as being inauthentic. He also remarked that it was an information gained from al-Isrā'īliyyāt, i.e. Jewish sources.² Apparently Ka^cb al-Ahbār, the narrator, who was described as a learned man of the people of the book,³ was reporting his own inference from the Old Testament. Probably he was the first to identify Idrīs with Enoch.

In his commentary on the Qur'ān, Abdullah Yusuf explained this point saying: Idrīs is mentioned twice in the Qur'ān, i.e. XIX-56-57 and XXI-85, where he is mentioned among those who patiently persevered. His identification with the Biblical Enoch, who "walked with God" (Gen. v.21-24), may or may not be correct, nor are we justified in interpreting verse XIX-57⁴ and giving it the same meaning as Gen., v.24 "God took him", so that he was taken up without passing through the portals of death. All we are told is that he was a man of truth and sincerity, and a Prophet, and that he had a high position among his people.⁵ Thus al-Suhaylī seemed to

1. Text, vol.3, p.465. cf. al-Tabarī, vol.16, pp.96-97.

2. Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr, vol.3, p.126; al-Anbiyā', pp.59-60.

3. Tadhkira, vol.1, p.52.

4. See above.

5. Translation and commentary of the Qur'ān (XIX-57).

have raised an unnecessary question. Certainly the station of Idrīs is lofty in comparison to other Prophets.

* * * * *

With regard to the account of al-Barā', ^C Āmir ibn Mālik ibn Ja^Cfar, known as "the player with the spears", who gave a promise of security to the Prophet's Companions who went to Najd,¹ al-Suhaylī gave a short biography of al-Barā' and explained why he was known as "the player with the spears". He then added that he had four other brothers. They were the uncles of Labīd ibn Rabī^Ca - the poet - who praised them in front of al-Nu^Cmān ibn al-Mundhir saying,

"We are the four sons of Umm al-Banīn".²

Al-Suhaylī explained why the poet said four instead of five while he was referring to his five uncles, saying that it was simply because one of them, Rabī^Ca, died long before this particular piece of poetry was composed.³

Al-Suhaylī then reproached al-Farrā', quoting first his opinion which was that the poet meant to say five but he said four so as to keep the rhyme.⁴ Our author commented, "A poet is not permitted to make a simple grammatical mistake to keep the rhyme, how about telling lies then?"⁵

He also found it most surprising that al-Farrā' used the same method to elucidate the meaning of this Qur'ānic verse, "But for such as fear the time when they will stand before (the

1. Text, vol.6, p.177.

2. Ibid., p.203; cf. Ṭabaqāt Fuhūl al-Shu^Carā', pp.103; 113-14.

3. Ibid., p.204.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

judgement seat of) their Lord, there will be two gardens" (LV-46). According to our author, al-Farrā', in the explanation of this verse, said, "What was meant is only one garden but the duality was used to keep the rhyme.¹ Al-Suhaylī who was much distressed about this remark, advised his readers to beware of such a saying and described it as horrid, far from knowledge and the true comprehension of the Qur'ān.² He also alluded to al-Farrā' saying, "The one who said so is likely to take his seat in the fire".³ And added, "If the one who is ignorant kept silent, differences will be only few". However, al-Farrā' did not say explicitly what was meant was one garden.⁴ Though this certainly shows al-Suhaylī as a zealous Muslim who would not hesitate to criticize or even severely rebuke anyone - regardless of his scholarly position - for passing such careless remarks on the sacred text of the Qur'ān, or even alluding to.

* * * * *

Pertaining to the account of the ascent to heaven and the revelation of Sūrat al-Najm (LIII), al-Suhaylī pointed out that scholars were of two different opinions on the question of the Prophet's vision of God on the ascent to heaven.

He first quoted the opinion of ^CĀ'isha who denied categorically that the Prophet had seen God. It was reported on the authority of Masrūq that she said, "He who presumed that Muhammad saw his Lord (with his ocular vision) fabricated the greatest lie against God. She quoted as a proof the verse, "Eyes comprehend Him not, but He comprehends (all) vision, and He is subtle, and All-Aware"⁵ (VI-103).

1. Text, vol.6, p.204.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p.205, cf. Ma^Cānī, vol.3, p.118; Qurtubī, vol.17, p.177.

5. Text, vol.3, p.445. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, book of faith, 1, III; al-Bukhārī, vol.6, p.359; vol.4, p.301; al-Tabarī, vol.27, pp.50-51.

The second opinion was that of Ibn ^cAbbās and Ka^cb al-Aḥbār, who held that the Prophet did actually see God on that occasion.¹ Ka^cb was reported to have said that God divided his speech and vision between Moses and Muhammad.²

Al-Suhaylī also quoted a tradition preserved by Muslim on the authority of Abū Dharr, who asked the Prophet whether he had seen God. He answered "I saw light",³ or according to to another tradition, he replied "wherever I looked there was light".⁴ He commented saying, "In both traditions there was not a concrete proof that he saw his Lord."⁵ He went on to say that it was reported on the authority of Abū al-Hasan al-Ash^carī that he said "He saw Him with his carnal eyes".⁶ A similar opinion was attributed to Aḥmad ibn Hanbal. Our author who seemed to have held the second view, quoted al-Zuhri, who rejected ^cĀ'isha's opinion saying: We do not hold that ^cĀ'isha is more knowledgeable than Ibn ^cAbbās".⁷ He also narrated that ^cĀ'isha's view used to distress ^cUrwa to a great extent. After this exposition of different views, al-Suhaylī concluded that the Prophet saw God, though he did not see Him in the same way he is going to see Him on the final day, but in a lesser way. He considered the Prophet to have alluded to this meaning when he said "I saw light" or "wherever I looked there was light".⁸ Al-Suhaylī's predecessor, al-Qādī ^cIyād, was of the same opinion as according to him the vision of God is impossible in this world, merely because people's eyes are incapable of seeing Him, but those whose eyes are capable can

1. Text, vol.3, p.445. cf. al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., p.48.

2. Ibid. cf. Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.2, p.288.

3. Ibid. cf. Muslim, op. cit.

4. Ibid.

5. Text, vol.3, p.445.

6. Ibid. cf. Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.2, p.292.

7. Text, vol.3, p.446.

8. Ibid.

see what it is in their capacity to see of Him.¹

It is worth remarking that differences of opinion concerning the Prophet's vision of God came about as a result of different interpretations of these verses, "The (Prophet's) (mind and) heart in no way falsified that which he saw. Will ye then dispute with him concerning what he saw? For indeed he saw him at a second descent" (LIII-11-13), besides the traditions above quoted in this connection. According to another scholar, Ibn al-Qayyim, who seemed to be well aware of our author's opinion the Prophet's Companions agreed unanimously that he did not see his Lord.² He also quoted Ibn Taymiyya's view, who held that there was no contradiction between this opinion and that of Ibn ^CAbbās because it was reported in a sound tradition that the Prophet saw his Lord in a dream while in Mecca, not on the occasion of isrā' and the vision of Prophet's is real. According to him this also explained what Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal meant when saying, the Prophet saw God.³ Ibn al-Qayyim added that if Ibn ^CAbbās relied on those verses - above quoted - as a proof which was likely to be the case, he has no proof in these because the one seen and referred to here was Gabriel, since it was reported in a sound tradition that the Prophet said he saw him only twice in his original form in which he was created.*

* * * * *

Pertaining to the same sūra, i.e. al-Najm, al-Suhaylī explained the verses, "Then he approached and came closer, and was at a distance of but two bow-lengths or (even) nearer" (LIII-8,9). He pointed out that the approaching and

1. Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.2, p.298.

2. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.48.

3. Ibid. ; al-Fatāwa, vol.3, p.387.

4. Zād al-Ma^Cād; vol.2, p.48, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.1, p.111; al-Tabarī, vol.27, p.51.

coming closer were attributed by some commentators to the Prophet himself; others hold that it is Gabriel who was meant.¹ He added that it was reported in a sound tradition that God Himself approached the Prophet. However despite the authenticity of this tradition, the commentators would have none of it on the ground of the impossibility of its external meaning.²

According to our author if the experience of the mi^c rāj was visionary, then there was no obscurity as it was reported in another tradition that the Prophet saw God in a dream. He even put His hand on the Prophet's chest till he felt the cold of it,³ but if it was reported on the physical experience then it could be understood in the same way as another similar tradition which is believed to be sound, that the Prophet said, "God descends every night to the nearest heaven to earth..." since both traditions are similar from the standpoint of exegesis.⁴ To support his view that God Himself could approach, al-Suhaylī quoted a tradition to the effect that, on the day of mi^c rāj when Gabriel sensed the approaching of God, he prostrated himself and started praising and glorifying God until God revealed to the Prophet what He wanted to reveal. The Prophet was reported to have said that when Gabriel raised up his head, he saw him in his original form.⁵ Our author's comment here is consistent with his earlier remark concerning the vision of God. According to him God can approach and can be seen.

1. Text, vol.3, p.446. cf. al-Tabari, vol.27, pp.44-46.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid. cf. al-Tabarī, op. cit., p.48, al-Tirmidhī, vol.5, pp.44-47.

4. Text, vol.3, p.449.

5. Ibid.

Al-Suhaylī's treatment of the Isrā'

Taking up the questions of the isrā' and the mi^crāj, whether the experience was visionary or physical, al-Suhaylī adopted both, making two separate experiences, one visionary, another physical.

He started the discussion by posing the question: was the experience visionary or physical?¹ He then quoted Ibn Ishāq as he reported on the authority of ^cĀ'isha and Mu^cāwiya that it was only the Prophet's spirit that was transported; his body remained where it was in Mecca. Our author then said: Those who adhere to this belief quote as a proof the verse: "We made the vision (ru'yā) which we showed thee only for a test to men" (XIII-60), saying that the word ru'yā was used in the days of the Prophet only to indicate a dream.² On the other hand, those who hold that it was a physical experience quote the same verse arguing that if it was visionary, then there was nothing at all incredible about it, besides the fact that consequently some of the Muslims gave up their faith, saying that a caravan takes a month to go to Jerusalem and a month to return, while Muhammad alleged that he did the return journey in one night!³ Al-Suhaylī then stated his opinion following his teacher Abū Bakr ibn al-^cArabī who held both opinions to be genuine, saying that the night journey occurred twice. The first one was visionary and it took place before the Prophet's mission; the second one was physical, taking place after his mission.⁴

According to Ibn al-^cArabī, the first isrā' was a preliminary step towards the second and God did it out of

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.415.
 2. Ibid., p.416.
 3. Ibid., cf. p.398.
 4. Ibid., p.417.

mercy to the Prophet as human nature is not capable of enduring such an experience as isrā' without preparation.¹ Thus the first isrā' was merely intended to pave the way for the second.

After quoting his teacher's opinion, al-Suhaylī provided a long passage supporting it, the substance of which is that both traditions are sound and the transmitters are authentic, but they are different in some details and the only way to reconcile the two versions is to admit that the isrā' happened twice.² Referring to the traditions al-Suhaylī pointed out that in one version it was reported that the Prophet met Abraham in the sixth heaven and Moses in the seventh while in the other version it was vice versa.³ He added that in the first tradition it was related that the Prophet was brought three vessels containing milk, wine and water, while in the second there was no mention of water but there was honey instead.⁴ Al-Suhaylī seemed to have realized that his arguments were very weak as these were only minor differences. Therefore he sought to find proofs from the Qur'ān. He quoted the verse, "Then he approached and came closer, and was at a distance of but two bow-lengths or (even) nearer so did (God) convey the inspiration to his servant (conveyed) what he (meant) to convey" (LIII-8). He also quoted the verse, "The (Prophet's mind) and heart in no way falsified that which he saw" (LIII-11). Al-Suhaylī considered the last verse as a proof for those who hold the isrā' to be visionary. He said that it lends support to the tradition on the authority of Anas who said referring to the Prophet, that he saw what he saw in a state when his eyes were asleep but his heart was awake.⁵ He also

1. Text, vol.3, p.417; Sharḥ al-Tirmidhī, vol.11, p.295.

2. Ibid., p.418.

3. Ibid. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Kitāb al-Īmān, vol.1, p.102.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.399. cf. p.418, Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Tawḥīd, vol.9, pp.449-53.

quoted the verse, "Do ye dispute with him concerning what he sees?" (LIII-12), arguing that the implication of the verb (sees) yarā, being in the present tense is to indicate potential experience. Thus in the second instance when God said, "For indeed he saw him at a second descent", the word heart fu'ād was not used as in the first instance, but it was the word baṣar (sight) instead, "His sight never swerved, not did it go wrong". The word baṣar, according to al-Suhaylī, signified that it was a physical experience. He added that it is sufficient proof as it is followed by the verse, "For truly did he see, of the signs of his Lord, the greatest" (LIII-18), as it cannot be described as "greatest" if it was a vision, since what you see physically is more powerful than what you see in a dream.¹

The argument of Ibn al-Qayyim, although he did not mention al-Suhaylī by name, was probably intended to be a refutation of the view of our author.

He first asserted that the reference in the verses of Sūrat al-Najm - quoted by al-Suhaylī - was to Gabriel, as it was reported that the Prophet only saw him twice in the form in which God created him. According to him, once the Prophet saw him on earth, which was referred to by verses 5-10 of Sūrat al-Najm. The second time was referred to by verses 13, 14.

This obviously contradicted what was stated by al-Suhaylī, as he considered both occasions to be on the night journey. Thus he relied on the use of the word fu'ād in the first instance and baṣar in the second to conclude that the isrā' happened twice.³ Ibn al-Qayyim also ridiculed those who

1. Text, vol.3, p.419, cf. Jawāmi^c, p.68.

2. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.48.

3. Text, vol.3, p.418.

hold that isrā' happened twice simply because it is inconceivable that on both occasions prayer was prescribed as fifty and the Prophet kept going to and fro between God and Moses trying to reduce the number.¹

He also pointed out that it should not be understood from the tradition on the authority of ^CĀ'isha and Mu^Cā'wiya that the isrā' was a visionary experience. According to him there is a great difference between that and maintaining that only the Prophet's spirit was transported, because in a dream one perceives things without his spirit being involved or leaving his body. He went on to explain that in the same way the Prophet's chest was cut open while he was still alive,² his spirit was transported and he perceived things which usually other spirits perceive when they are separate from bodies. Nevertheless that happened to the Prophet in a supernatural way while he was still alive, a stage which is far superior to a mere dream.³

It is worth noting that both al-Suhaylī and Ibn al-Qayyim seemed not to differentiate between the isrā', i.e. the night journey and the mi^Crāj, i.e. the ascent into heaven, while the subject is debated by other scholars who hold that the isrā' and mi^Crāj did not happen on the same night. Some scholars also hold that the isrā' was a physical experience while the mi^Crāj was visionary. Al-Suhaylī himself quoted this view as a fourth view on the subject. He also quoted their argument which was that since the unbelievers found it most extraordinary to talk about the isrā', while they did not find it difficult to believe in the mi^Crāj, this shows that the latter was visionary so that there was nothing incredible about it.⁴

1. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.49.

2. Ibid. c.f. Text, vol.2, pp.168-174. c.f. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, The book of faith, vol.1, p.103; Dalā'il, vol.1, pp.350-54.

3. Zād al-Ma^Cād, vol.2, p.49.

4. Text, vol.3, p.429.

However, al-Suhaylī who was very enthusiastic in his opinion that the isrā' happened twice, paid no attention to the latter view. He only mentioned it in his exposition of other opinions on the subject.¹ However, this opinion seemed most likely to be the correct one since all those who narrated the account of the isrā' to Ibn Ishāq did not mention the mi^crāj as happening on the same night.

In the first version of ^cAbd Allāh ibn Mas^cūd which Ibn Ishāq preceded by fī mā balaghanī ^canhu, i.e. from what I have heard on his authority, the anonymous narrator who related the account to Ibn Ishāq did not specify the starting point of the isrā', but he specified the finishing point as the temple of Jerusalem where the Prophet acted as Imām, i.e. leader of prayer to all the Prophets whom he found assembled there.²

In the second account on al-Hasan's authority which is prefaced by a passive verb, huddithu, i.e. I was told, it is much more certain that the Prophet started the isrā' from Mecca and ended in the temple of Jerusalem, where he led the prayer for all previous Prophets. It was also related that on the morning of the isrā', the Prophet told the people that he had been to Jerusalem and back during the night and that this caused some of the Muslims to give up their faith, although he was able to describe for them the temple. All these details attest that the Prophet made no reference to the mi^crāj on that morning. Otherwise people were likely to give up their faith on the account of the journey to heaven rather than that to Jerusalem.³

1. Text, vol.3, p.429. cf. p.418.

2. Ibid., p.396.

3. Ibid., p.397.

It is worth remarking that Guillaume found it most surprising that al-Hasan who was in favour of the view of ^CĀ'isha and Mu^Cāwīya, ended his account quoting the verse, "We made the vision which We showed thee only for a test to men" (XIII-60),¹ but it will not be surprising if we know that both parties, i.e. those who hold the isrā' to be physical or those who hold it to be visionary, quote the same verse as a proof.

The first party use the verse to elucidate their argument that if it was visionary there was nothing incredible about it to be a test to men. The second party examining the verse from the standpoint of language concluded that the word ru'yā was used only to refer to a dream. Even so, the first party argued that the word can also be used to refer to physical sight and they quote as a proof a verse of poetry where the poet was said to be describing a hunter:

He was excited about the (ru'yā) sight,
his mind was delighted,
his heart was so pleased,
after he had been in great anxiety.²

Pertaining to isrā', the most emphatic version is that of Umm Hāni', daughter of Abū Tālib who said, "The Apostle went on no night journey except while he was in my house. He slept that night in my house. He prayed the final night prayer, then he slept and we slept. A little before dawn the Apostle woke us, and when we had prayed the dawn prayer he said, 'O Umm Hāni', I prayed with you the last evening

1. Life of Muḥammad, introduction, xx.

2. The poet was ^CUbayd ibn Ḥusayn known as al-Rā^Cī. Ibn Sallām al-Jumhī classified him one of the first class Muslim poets. See Ṭabaqāt Fuhūl al-Shu^Carā', pp.434-50; al-Sh^Carā', vol.1, pp.377-81.

prayer in this valley as you saw. Then I went to Jerusalem and prayed there. Then I have just prayed the morning prayer with you as you see'. He got up to go out and I took hold of his robe and laid bare his belly as though it were a folded Egyptian garment. I said, 'O Prophet of God, do not talk to the people about it for they will call you a liar and insult you'. He said, 'By God, I certainly will tell them'."¹

Al-Bukhārī narrated on the authority of Anas ibn Mālīk via Sharīk ibn ʿAbd Allāh in a chapter entitled "The eyes of the Prophet used to sleep, but his heart used not to sleep".² The narrator said the Prophet perceived their presence (the angels) with his heart, for the eyes of the Prophet were closed when he was asleep, but his heart was not asleep.³ In another version on the same authorities, it was made crystal clear that the mi^crāj was a visionary experience. Anas started the account of the mi^crāj with the previous phrase, "He saw them (the angels) his eyes were asleep but his heart was not".⁴ He ended the account after he related all the details of the mi^crāj saying, "The Prophet then woke while he was in the Sacred Mosque (at Mecca).⁵ These various traditions present problems for scholars who try to combine the mi^crāj and the isrā'. However, throughout his commentary, al-Suhaylī has adopted a method of reconciling seemingly contradictory accounts. Whenever he comes across such traditions he provides a ready solution by saying simply that the incident happened twice or several times if more than one tradition were in question. It is worth noting that Ibn al-Qayyim ascribed this method to what he described as the weak traditionists of the

1. Text, vol.3, p.401.

2. Ṣaḥīḥ, chapter of al-mi^crāj, vol.5, p.143. cf. vol.1, p.211; vol.4, p.494.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., the book of Tawhīd, vol.9, pp.449-453.

Zāhirites, who tend to determine the number of incidents according to the number of versions they find.¹ It may well be said that al-Suhaylī was unconsciously influenced by the Zāhirites as it is well known that the Andalusian scholar Ibn Hazm, d.456, codified the Zāhirite doctrine and applied its methods to all the Qur'ānic sciences. Although al-Suhaylī did not differentiate between the isrā' and the mi^crāj, nevertheless he seemed to have held that mi^crāj was a visionary experience. This is evident in his speculations with regard to it.

Al-Suhaylī's speculations on the mi^crāj

In the account of the ascent to heaven Ibn Ishāq reported that the Prophet saw particular Prophets on that occasion. Our author examined the significance of seeing these Prophets, i.e. Adam, Abraham, Jesus, Moses, etc. He explained that the understanding of that comes from the science of ta^cbīr i.e. interpretation of dreams, which is regarded as one of the sciences of prophecy. He continues: The learned people in this science hold that he who sees a Prophet in a dream is likely to be in a similar situation to the Prophet whom he sees, whether it be ease or hardship or any other situation recorded in the Qur'ān or the tradition.² In other words, that the person who sees a prophet in a dream will experience, or have experienced, a predicament which is parallel to a similar one exemplified in the life of the Prophet who is seen.

Al-Suhaylī then said: The first to be seen by the Prophet, was Adam. His situation at the beginning was similar to that of the Prophet, because Adam too lived in the vicinity of God until his enemy, Satan, turned him out. In the same manner the Prophet was turned out of Mecca, the sanctuary of

1. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.49.

2. Text, vol.3, p.450.

God, by his enemies.¹

In the second heaven the Prophet saw Jesus and John (Yahyā). Both were tested by Jews; Jesus' message was falsified and he himself was reviled and persecuted, almost to the point of death, but God intervened and caused him to ascend to Heaven. As for John, he was killed by the Jews. Similarly, the Prophet, when he migrated to Medina was also tested by the Jews, who tormented him, conspired against him, and were about to drop a rock on him, but God saved him as he saved Jesus. Later a Jewish woman offered him a leg of mutton which contained poison which affected him till he died. In this respect he was similar to John.² Al-Suhaylī continues: In the third heaven the Prophet met Joseph (Yūsuf) who was reunited with his brothers after they turned him out, nevertheless he forgave them and said: "No harm will befall ye today" (XII-92). Likewise the Prophet, on the day of Badr captured some of his people who had driven him out of Mecca, including some of his relatives, namely his uncle al-^cAbbās and his cousin ^cAqīl. Some he forgave and from some he accepted ransom. After his victory over Mecca, he gathered them together and said: "I say to you what my brother Joseph said, 'No harm will befall you today'".³

In the fourth heaven, the Prophet met Idrīs who was the first to learn how to write. This signified a similar state of the Prophet, as he reached high esteem and even kings feared his power when he wrote inviting them to his cause. Abū Sufyān was present with the Roman emperor when the latter received the Prophet's letter. On seeing how the emperor was troubled, Abū Sufyān remarked: "Verily the cause of Ibn Abī Kabsha has reached a high esteem;⁴ even the king of Banū al-

1. Text, vol.3, p.450.

2. Ibid., p.451.

3. Ibid. cf. p.452.

4. See p.292 below.

Asfar fears him".¹ The Prophet wrote to all the kings; some like al-Najāshi, i.e. ^{the} Negus, and the king of ^cUmān followed him, some like Heraclius and al-Muqawqis tried to come to an agreement with him and presented him with gifts and others preferred to confront him, but finally God made him victorious over them. So the similarity between the Prophet and Idrīs was the employment of writing, besides reaching high esteem, as God said concerning Idrīs, "Verily we have raised him to a high place" (XIX-57).²

In the fifth heaven the Prophet met Aaron (Harūn), who was loved by his people. This signifies the eventual love of Quraysh and all the Arabs for the Prophet after a long period of enmity; while in the sixth heaven he met Moses, who had overcome the Jabābira and had led Banū Isrā'īl, after the destruction of their enemies, back into the city from which they had been expelled. Similarly the Prophet conquered Mecca and led his followers into the town from which they had been expelled. Al-Suhaylī went on to say: The meeting with Abraham in the seventh heaven was significant for two reasons: first, he met him near al-Bayt al-Ma^cmūr, i.e. the much frequented house to which the angels make the pilgrimage. This was a reminder that Abraham himself had built the Ka^cba and been the first to call the people to perform pilgrimage.³ The second significance was that the last thing the Prophet did was the pilgrimage to the sacred house and with him were more than seventy thousand Muslims.⁴ Furthermore this is the opinion of the exegetes, that the vision of Abraham signified performing pilgrimage. In saying this al-

1. Text, vol.3, p.451. cf. Ta'rīkh, vol.2, p.648.

2. Ibid., p.452.

3. This first appears to be not so much a separate significance as an explanation of the relationship between Abraham and al-bayt al-ma^cmūr.

4. Text, vol.3, p.453.

Suhaylī infers that only with regard to the seventh heaven is there agreement between himself and the exegetes, and that the others are the result of his own speculation. Thus he concluded: Although our aim was not to take upon ourselves the task of explaining anything without authority from the predecessors (sālf), this aim has been contradicted by the fact that we are obliged to think and meditate on the wisdom of God and to consider His signs.¹ To support this view al-Suhaylī quoted the verse: "Verily in that are signs for those who reflect" (XXX-21). He added, it was also reported that an hour's meditation is better than a whole year's worship. However, speculation is permissible only on condition that one takes due consideration of the Qur'ān and traditions as well as the usage of Arabic language. Otherwise any opinion concerning the Qur'ān or the tradition would be without knowledge or foundation.²

Although when speaking with regard to the isrā', i.e. night journey, al-Suhaylī endeavoured to prove that isrā' happened twice - once as a vision, and a second time physically - he seemed to have held that the mī^crāj (ascent to heaven), was a nocturnal vision. This is evident in his above attempt to interpret it as such. However, he seemed to have exerted a lot of his energies in interpolating his own hypothetical assumptions. However, al-Ghazālī in his Iḥyā' devoted a chapter to the necessity of meditation and reflection, al-Suhaylī was probably influenced by him. Moreover it is the Sufis and al-Ghazālī^{above all} who attached great importance to dreams and their interpretation. Al-Suhaylī extended the information to deal with al-bayt al-ma^cmūr,³ (LII-4). It is reported in the Sīra that every day seventy thousand angels went in, not to come back until the Day of Resurrection. Our author quoted

1. Ibid. cf. (XIII-3),(XXX-21),(IXL-42),(XLV-13.)

2. Text, vol.3, p.453.

3. See above.

from other sources.¹ Al-bayt al-ma^cmūr is in the seventh heaven, which is called ^cAribā', whilst the bayt is called al-Ḍurāḥ. It was said that every day seventy thousand chiefs enter it, every chief in command of seventy thousand angels. Abū Hurayra reported that the Prophet said: In the seventh heaven there is a house called al-ma^cmūr perpendicularly in line with Mecca. There is also a river called al-Ḥayawān. Gabriel enters it every day, when he comes out he shakes off the drops from which God creates seventy thousand angels and orders them to go and pray in al-bayt al-ma^cmūr. When they finish their prayer they depart never to return. One of them would be put in charge and they would stand in a certain place in heaven, praising God until the Day of Resurrection.²

This tradition quoted above by al-Suhaylī was preserved by Ibn Abī Ḥātim, but was rejected by some scholars as inauthentic. Ibn Kathīr described it as very obscure (gharīb jiddan), and concerning al-bayt al-ma^cmūr, he said: It is a temple which numerous heavenly beings frequently visit for the adoration of their Creator. It is said to have been the spiritual prototype of the Ka^cba in Mecca".³ Abd Allah Yusuf Ali said: "The much frequented Fane (or house) is usually understood to mean the Ka^cba",⁴ whilst Guillaume suggested it could be a reference to paradise.⁵ However, the account of the ascent to heaven cannot allow this as, after mentioning al-bayt al-ma^cmūr, the Prophet said: Then he (i.e. the angel) took me into paradise.⁶ The more suitable explanation seems to be that of the former, who added: It may be taken generally to mean

-
1. Cf. Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī, vol.27, pp.16-17; Ibn Kathīr, vol.4, p.240.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.454.
 3. Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr, vol.4, p.240.
 4. Commentary on the Qur'ān (LII-4).
 5. Life of Muhammad, p.186.
 6. Text, vol.3, p.444.

any temple or house of worship dedicated to the true God. He has also taken it figuratively to mean the heart of man. He said: The fane is much frequented as there is a universal desire in the heart of man to worship God, and his sacred Temples draw Large Crowds of devotees.¹ However it is the opinion of al-Ghazālī that al-bayt al-ma^cmūr is the spiritual prototype of the Ka^cba in Mecca.²

* * * * *

Also pertaining to Sūrat al-Najm is the account of the so-called Satanic verses. In the Sīra Ibn Hishām made no reference to the cause of the return of the Prophet's Companions from Abyssinia.³ Ibn Ishāq has, in fact, provided the account as two other scholars have preserved it on his authority; al-Ṭabarī via Salama ibn al-Fadl⁴ and Yūnus directly from Ibn Ishāq though his account is much more abridged than that of al-Ṭabarī.⁵ Perhaps Ibn Hishām omitted this account in fulfilment of his principles as the account was regarded as unreliable by many scholars.

Al-Suhaylī, who normally had the habit of providing long detailed accounts, was unusually brief on the subject. Though he did not follow the example of Ibn Hishām by omitting the whole story altogether. Indicating his sources as Mūsā ibn ^cUqba and Ibn Ishāq - not via al-Bakkā'i's version - he reported that the Muslims in Abyssinia heard that the Meccans had accepted Islam, but later on they learned that the report was false.⁶ He goes on to explain the reason for that saying:

-
1. Sūra LII-4.
 2. Cf. Iḥyā', vol.1, p.352.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.330.
 4. Tafsīr, vol.17, p.187. cf. Ta'rīkh, vol.2, pp.337-340.
 5. Yūnus, p.157, pas.219.
 6. Text, vol.3, p.344. cf. p.330.

It was because when the Prophet recited the Sūrat al-Najm, Satan put upon his tongue when al-Lāt and al-^cUzzā, the unbelievers' idols, were mentioned, "These are the exalted gharānīq whose intercession is to be hoped for". When the unbelievers heard that, they were delighted and greatly pleased at the way in which the Prophet spoke of their gods. The Prophet prostrated himself when he reached the end of the Sūra, the Muslims and the polytheists prostrated themselves too.¹ Then it was revealed to the Prophet, "But God will annul what Satan has suggested" (XXII-52). Thus the Muslims in Abyssinia heard that Quraysh had become Muslims.² He added that theologians refute this account by arguments - which he did not specify³ - but those who hold it to be sound speculated that it was Satan who actually said the words and not the Prophet.⁴ Al-Suhaylī commented: This is acceptable if only they had not said in the same account that Gabriel came to the Prophet and told him that he had recited something that was not revealed to him.⁵ He then concluded the different opinions saying: Other scholars hold that the Prophet said these words from himself and he meant the angels whose intercession is to be hoped⁶ for. In another version it was reported that the Prophet said it repeating what the polytheists say about their gods by way of exposing the absurdity of their claim. Our author then expressed his own opinions saying that the whole tradition seems not to be sound to him.⁷

-
1. Text, vol.3, pp.344,330. cf. al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, vol. 17, pp.187-188; Ta'rikh, vol.2, pp.337-340.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.344.
 3. Ibid. for a thorough discussion on these arguments. cf. Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.4, pp.83-103; al-Rāzī, vol.6, pp.167-171.
 4. Ibid. cf. al-Firaq, p.210.
 5. Cf. Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī, vol.17, pp.187-188.
 6. Cf. Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.4, p.101, al-Rāzī, vol.6, p.171.
 7. Text, vol.3, p.343.

When it comes to the discussion of the problem, it is clear that al-Suhaylī has in mind al-Ṭabarī's version. This is evident from the different accounts he alluded to.¹ In rejecting this account, al-Suhaylī was preceded by many others. For instance, al-Qādī ʿIyād, devoted some pages to the refutation of the story in his book al-Shifā'. Reviewing all the various reports connected with the so-called Satanic verses, he drew the conclusion that the tradition on the subject cannot stand external and internal criticism as it lacks conformity to the requirements of a true narration. Thus all the authentic ḥadīth collections, namely the six Ṣaḥīḥs did not record it.² Al-Qādī also rejected the story because it contradicted the idea of the Prophet being infallible. He regarded this account as invented and foisted upon heedless traditionists so as to confuse the weak Muslims.³

Although al-Qādī ʿIyād was an Andalusian scholar and considerably older than al-Suhaylī (476-544), even so, our author made no reference to him. Probably he avoided quoting a man who remained faithful to the Almoravids, as it is well known that al-Qādī ʿIyād did not pay homage to the Almohads. It could hardly be suggested that al-Suhaylī did not see al-Qādī's well known book al-Shifā',⁴ as many traditions concerning miracles of the Prophet were recorded in the same way by the two scholars.⁵

-
1. Cf. Tafsīr, vol.17, pp.187-188, Ta'rīkh, vol.2, pp.337-340.
 2. Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.4, pp.83-103. Although al-Bukhārī recorded the prostration of the polytheists, he did not refer to the so-called Satanic verses. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.6, pp.363-364.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Cf. p.208 above.
 5. See for instance: Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.3, p.86 / Text, vol.5, p.248; Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.3, p.78/Text, vol.7, p.526; Sharḥ al-Shifā', vol.3, p.119/Text, vol.7, p.428.

In a recent study, another scholar has discussed the problem of the Satanic verses.¹ He added a new factor to the arguments of al-Qādī ^cIyād. As he endeavours to show that the story must be fabricated because of the dates involved. Thus he shows that the date of the alleged Satanic verses must be prior to the return of some emigrants from Abyssinia (i.e. the 5th year of the Prophet's mission), whereas the date of the admonition of the Prophet (XVII-73-75) was the 10th year of the Prophetic call and the abrogation (XXII-52) was in the first year of the hijra, i.e. about 8 to 9 years after the incident. Thus if the dating is correct the story is hardly likely to be true.³ In addition, according to Richard Bell the dates of the revelation of the verses involved are in conformity with what that scholar has said.* This probably substantiates the validity of his argument.

* * * * *

Concerning Sūrat ^cAbasa (LXXX), and with reference to the first verse, "He frowned and turned his back when the blind man came to him" (LXXX-1), al-Suhaylī pointed out that there is nothing slanderous in referring to somebody by a peculiarity

-
1. "The 'Satanic' verses and the orientalist", an article by M.M. Ahsan.
 2. Ibid., cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.206.
 3. See Hamdard Islamicus, vol.5, n.1, pp.27-36.
 4. Richard Bell has classified verses 19, 20 from Sūrat al-Najm as belonging to a fairly late Meccan period. Though he made a footnote to the effect that these two verses were followed by the 'Satanic verses' which reconciled the Meccans and led to the return of some of those who had emigrated to Abyssinia. The Qur'ān, vol.2, p.541. cf. vol.1, p.322.

in his physical appearance like blindness or lameness, except if intended to cause offence. In such a case it would be a sin and a deed of those who are ignorant as God says, "Makest thou a laughing-stock of us?" He said: "God save me from being an ignorant person" (II-67).¹ He continues, there is a subtle allusion in drawing attention to the cause of the reproach. This is signified by the mentioning of the man's approaching associated with his blindness, which expresses the undergoing of hardship, and whoever undergoes hardship to come to you, you should pay attention to him, not turn away.² Thus if the Prophet was reproached for that, even though the blind man was not a believer at the time, others are more deserving of reproach in similar circumstances. Al-Suhaylī then quoted as a proof the verse, "How could you tell? He might have been seeking to purify himself", saying: If he was a believer the Prophet was not likely to have turned away from him. And if he had, the reproach might have been more severe. Moreover, he was not likely to be referred to in the Qur'ān by his blindness rather than his faith, had he been a Muslim.³ However, he was likely to have embraced Islam after the revelation of this verse. This can also be proved by his addressing the Prophet saying: O Muḥammad, instead of, O Apostle of God. The surface meaning of the phrase indicates that the 'Hā' in the word (la^c allahu), i.e. he might, referring to the blind man and not to the unbeliever, as the latter had not yet been mentioned, and the word la^c alla signifies waiting and hoping. Had his faith preceded the revelation of the verse, he would have been a step beyond merely waiting and hoping for purification.⁴ However, al-Suhaylī has no data to support his view that, had the blind man been a believer, the reproach would have been harsher.

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.329.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid., p.330.
 4. Ibid.

Similar is his inference that there is no harm in calling people by their disability, as the disability was mentioned in this instance particularly to emphasise the cause of the censure. Hence, even if the man was a believer at the time, the mentioning of his disability was still relevant. As the contrast was between a helpless man who undertook the task of coming to the Prophet, seeking to know about Islam, and a powerful man who was not in the least interested. Furthermore, the Prophet's approach to these two men; the blind man was trying to catch the attention of the Prophet whilst the Prophet was trying to catch the attention of the powerful man. The issue here is not merely how an individual or a class of people should be treated, although that was the significance of the Qur'ānic comment on the incident itself, taken in isolation. The core of the matter is that people should learn how to derive their values from the divine being. Thus man's sound position should always be disregarded when judging spiritual worth. The basic standard that man is commanded to adopt is, "The noblest of you in God's sight is he who fears him most" (XLIX-13).¹

It could also be said that on a deeper level the Prophet was dealing with two blind men, the one physically, the other spiritually blind. In this case God may be rebuking the Prophet for his treatment of the physically blind man whilst failing to perceive the "spiritual" blindness of the other.

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq related that whenever the Prophet was mentioned, Al-^cĀṣ ibn Wā'il al-Sahmī used to say, "Let him alone for he is a man with no offspring. If he were to die, his memory would perish and you would have rest from him". In reference to that God revealed Sūrat al-Kawthar (CVIII) "We

1. Cf. Zilāl, vol.30, p.41.

have given you the abundance".¹ Al-Suhaylī provided different views saying: It was also reported that: The man who said that of the Prophet was Abū Jahl, and according to yet another version, Ka^c b ibn al-Ashraf, if it had been Ka^c b the sūra would have been revealed in Medina. Yūnus (ibn Bukayr) narrated that al-Qāsim, the Prophet's son, died at the age when he could ride a mount, and on that occasion al-^cĀṣ said: Now Muhammad is cut off from his offspring.² Therefore this sūra was revealed "We have given you the abundance" as compensation for your loss of al-Qāsim, "He who hates you is the one cut off" (CVIII-3). The Arabic words of this last verse are inna shāni'aka huwa al-abtar - al-Suhaylī speculated that: The word huwa was used here to emphasise the meaning and serve the purpose of particularising. He gives examples for such usage from the Qur'ān as well as his own paradigm.³ In connection with the Qur'ān he quotes God's saying "And it is He who makes rich and poor" (LIII-48). Since some people think that wealth can be gained by ways other than from God, so in the verse it is He and not anyone else - likewise his saying "And it is He who created life and death" (LIII-44). As al-Nimrod (II-258)⁴ for instance alleged that he was capable of causing to die and causing to live. Thus God emphasised that it is God only, no one else can do that. In the same manner is the verse, "And it is He who is Lord of Shi^c rā"

1. Text, vol.3, p. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.30, p.320.

2. Text, vol.3, p.402. cf. Yūnus, p.229.

3. Text, vol.3, pp.402-403.

4. The reference in verse 258 or Sūrat al-Baqara is believed to be to Nimrod or Nimrodh ibn Kan^c ān, ruler of Babylonia who disputed with Abraham. He was also referred to in verse (XXI-68) involving the fire incident. cf. al-Rāzi, vol.2, p.317. See also footnote 1565 Commentary, Yūsuf 'Alī.

(LIII-49) since they used to worship deities besides God. It was revealed that it is God who is Lord of them all, including al-Shi^cra, i.e. Sirius, which they held in high esteem and worshipped as a divinity. But when the creation of mankind and the destruction of ^cĀd was mentioned, the word huwa was not used as no one else claimed the creation of mankind or the destruction of ^cĀd. Thus the meaning of "He who hates you is the one who is cut off" the emphasis is upon the information that it is him who is the one cut off and not you".¹

After assessing that the one who was cut off was al-^cĀs and not the Prophet, al-Suhaylī speculated as to how the former could be described thus whilst he had sons, and how the Prophet, who was described in the Qur'ān as "Muḥammad was not the father of any of your menfolk" (XXXIII-40) be described as not. The answer, he said, was that, although al-^cĀs had sons, they all became followers of Muḥammad, and consequently al-^cĀs could not inherit from them, nor they from him. in this sense he was cut off. To promote this view al-Suhaylī adopted a reading different from that in the Muṣḥaf saying: Ubay ibn Ka^cb recited "And he is a father for them" in reference to the Prophet after the verse "And his wives their mothers" (XXXIII-6). He went on to say al-^cĀs' sons and all the believers became followers¹ of the Prophet in this world and on the Day of Hereafter they will also follow him to the sacred waters of Paradise (ḥawḍ). Al-Suhaylī's opinion on the meaning of the abundance,² al-kawthar, could be summed up thus: Al-kawthar signifies the knowledge nourishing the souls of the multitude of the followers in this world, whilst in the world to come it refers to the multitude of the followers who drink from al-ḥawḍ which will grant them eternal life.

Al-Tabarī preserved several accounts relating that al-

1. Text, vol.3, p.404.

2. Ibid., pp.404, 405.

kawthar is a river in Paradise granted to the Prophet¹ but Ibn ^CAbbās contends that the river is but one part of the abundance which God has furnished for the Prophet.² Apparently al-Suhaylī has attempted to combine both explanations.

* * * * *

Al-Suhaylī also explained sūra (CIX) al-Kāfirūn. He said: the Prophet was told to say to the unbelievers "I do not worship what you worship", that is in the present, for the future, "I shall never worship what you worship", likewise "nor do you worship what I worship". But it could be asked why he said to them "Nor will you worship what I worship", when, having decided to worship his Lord, they said to him "come let us worship your Lord and you worship ours".³ There are two answers to that: first that he knew they were not going to worship Him, and for that reason he informed them of what he knew; secondly that even if they had worshipped Him in the way which they had described, it would not have been true worship, since one does not call someone a worshipper of God, who worships Him one year and other things the next.⁴ Al-Suhayli continues: it could also be asked why he said: "what¹ I worship" instead of "whom I worship" as the Arabic particle mā is applied only to inanimate objects. He then answered this question saying: The particle mā (what) can be applied to an animate being too - provided that there is an appropriate context. The context is present here due to the ambiguity and exaggeration in exaltation and glorification in this instance, since God is sublime and His very essence is

1. Tafsīr, vol.30, pp.320-330.

2. Ibid.

3. Text, vol.3, p.322. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.30, p.330.

4. Text, vol.3, p.322.

infinite and beyond comprehension, it is necessary to say "He is what He is", Huwa mā huwa .¹ Indeed as the Arabs used to say: Praise be to that which (mā) the thunder praises, and similarly God's saying: "By the firmament and that which (mā) constructed it" (XCI-5). The mā is used here because it is the creation of heavens and earth that necessitate the exaltation of God, not whether God is inanimate or not. Thus mā is used to explain the amazement at the greatness of Him Who accomplished such a wonderful creation whatever He is. Another verse where mā is used is "What prevented thee from prostrating thyself before that which (mā) I have created with my own hands" (XXXVIII-75). Because it was the command of God that necessitated the prostration, regardless of the object's being animate or inanimate. Thus in compliance with God's command the prostration was due to that creature whatever it was. So the prostration has no significance of exaltation.²

Returning to the original subject al-Suhaylī said: The mā was used in its proper usage in the verse, "I do not worship what you worship" as they were worshipping idols. Whilst in the other verse, "And you do not worship what I worship", the use of mā was necessitated by the ambiguity of the entity worshipped and its being above conception.³

Al-Suhaylī then drew attention to another anecdote which he described as marvellous and worth mentioning, that was the use of the past tense in the verse, "And I will not worship what you worshipped" (CIX-4) whilst in both verses 3 and 5, the present tense was used in reference to the Prophet "Nor will ye worship that which I worship" (CIX-3, 5). He explained this saying: Although mā is khābariyya, i.e. predicative, on the account of its ambiguity it gives the meaning of

1. Text, vol.3, p.323.

2. Ibid., p.324.

3. Ibid.

"condition", shart. Thus in the above quoted verse, i.e. CIX-4, the implied meaning of the speech will be: Whatever you worship I will never worship. From the standpoint of Arabic language, condition transfers the future tense to past tense literally. That explains why the verb following the mā is in the past tense as a condition cannot be in the present tense. Hence there is no condition in the second verse, "I do not worship what ye worship". Similarly there is no implied condition in verses 3 and 5, because the Prophet was not likely to transfer from the worship of God as he was infallible.¹ As for the nonbelievers, that was likely to happen because they were in the hands of Satan, who would lead them according to their desires. For that reason it was possible for them to worship one thing today and tomorrow another; nevertheless whatever they worshipped the Prophet would not worship. Our author then quoted another verse to illustrate his argument, that is God's saying "How can we talk to one who is an infant in the cradle" (XIX-29). Referring to the grammarians al-Suhaylī said: They were confused about the inflection of this verse, but al-Zajjāj understood it and explained it by saying: that man (who) implies condition and that is why it is followed by the past tense kāna (was). Thus the meaning of it is: How can we address whoever is still an infant? The question here was not associated with him² particularly but rather it was a general question, in which he was of course included. Thus the speech is more succinct.³

In his explanation of these three sūras; ^cAbasa, al-Kawthar and al-Kāfirūn, it is evident that al-Suhaylī has introduced his own method of exegesis, depending entirely on

1. Text, vol.3, p.324.

2. Ibid., p.326. cf. Badā'i^c al-Fawā'id, vol.1, pp.133-136; I^crāb, vol.1, p.338.

3. The reference is to Jesus, see sūra XIX-29. cf. Text, vol.3, p.326.

his vast knowledge of the language.

* * * * *

In the account concerning the coming of the deputations to the Prophet in the year 9 after the conquest of Mecca, Ibn Ishāq reported that Sūrat al-Naṣr (i.e. CX) was revealed on that occasion. He then explained it saying that the command was to the Prophet to praise God for His having made his religion victorious, and ask His pardon, for He is most forgiving.¹

Al-Suhaylī criticised this explanation and rejected it on ground that Ibn ^CAbbās explained it in a different way, moreover his explanation was approved of by ^CUmar. Our author produced the opinion of Ibn ^CAbbās who said: The third verse of the sūra "Celebrate the Praises of thy Lord, and pray for His forgiveness for He is oft-returning", was an indication of the termination of the Prophet's life.² Through it he was informed of the nearness of his death. Al-Suhaylī commented that although there is a surface meaning for this sūra, the opinion of Ibn ^CAbbās could be supported by the fact that the Prophet was not commanded to give thanks when the help of God comes and victory - as Ibn Ishāq interpreted it. Instead God commanded the Prophet to celebrate the Praises of the Lord and pray for His forgiveness. He pointed out that those who did not examine the verse carefully think that verse 3 is the conditional clause. According to him, the conditional clause in this sūra is omitted and this is one of the features of the Qur'an which occurred frequently. He paraphrased the sūra thus, "When the help of God comes and the victory, your mission is accomplished, death is approached, and the meeting

1. Text, vol.7, p.357. cf. al-Ṭabarī, vol.30, p.332.

2. Ibid. cf. al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., p.333.

with your Lord is become nearer. So celebrate the praises of your Lord and pray for His forgiveness. For He is oft returning".¹

However, according to Qur'ān exegetes both explanations are acceptable. But al-Suhaylī, in his support for the latter explanation and his implied rejection of the former, was probably influenced by al-Ghazālī's theory on the Qur'ān, as he minimizes the importance of those exegetes who confine themselves to the outward meaning of the Qur'ānic verses and exalts those exegetes who try to disclose the deep and hidden meanings of it.²

* * * * *

With regard to the ill treatment the Prophet received from his people, Ibn Ishāq mentioned Abū Lahab, the Prophet's uncle, who said: "Muhammad promises me things which I do not see. He alleges that they will happen after my death. What has he put in my hands after that? Then he blew on his hands and said, "May you perish. I see nothing in you of these things of which Muhammad speaks". So God revealed concerning him the words, "May the hands of Abū Lahab perish; doomed is he" (Sūra CXI).³

Al-Suhaylī commented: That was likely to be the reason for the revelation of this sūra for the mentioning of the hand.* As for the mentioning of "doomed is he", our author quoted a tradition from al-Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās, he related that when the verse, "And warn your kith

1. Text, vol.7, pp.381, 382. cf. al-Bukhārī, vol.6, pp.465-466.

2. Cf. Jawāhir al-Qur'ān, pp.19-20.

3. Text, vol.3, p.283.

4. Ibid., p.297.

and kin" (XXVI-214) was revealed the Prophet went out to al-Ṣafā, climbed it and summoned the people of Quraysh. When they came to him, he addressed them and said, "Were I to tell you that countrymen are proceeding up the side of this mountain would you believe me?" "Yes", they replied "We have never known you to lie."¹ "So listen to me", he went on. "I am warning you of gruesome torment (from God)". Abū Lahab was there and snapped at him, "Damn you! Have you gathered us for this?" Then this sūra (i.e. CXI) was revealed. The Arabic words of the verse above quoted are tabbat yadā Abī Lahabin wa tabb. Al-Suhaylī, making every endeavour to assess that this verse is khavar, provided a different reading; tabbat yadā Abī Lahabin wa qad tabb, i.e. "and he was already doomed". He attributed this way of reading to Mujāhid and al-A^c mash,² and suggested, though with words of caution, that this reading might have been taken from Ibn Mas^cūd because in the reading of Ibn Mas^cūd there were many words which helped in the interpretation. Mujāhid was reported to have said: "Had I been acquainted with the reading of Ibn Mas^cūd before I asked Ibn ^cAbbās I would not have needed to ask him most of what I asked".³ In confirmation of what Mujāhid had said, al-Suhaylī added: In the same manner was the word "qad" which was added to this verse (i.e. CXI-1). It explained that the verse is a khavar from God and not a curse, du^c ā' like in another of God's sayings, "God's curse be on them: how deluded are they away from the truth" (IX-30), which means: "They deserve to be cursed". So the verse in question is not of the same kind; rather it is a khavar,

1. Text, vol.3, p.297. cf. al-Bukhārī, vol.6, p.467.

2. Text, vol.3, p.297. Al-Ṭabarī attributed this way of reading to an anonymous ^cAbd Allāh. Probably that was the cause of al-Suhaylī's caution. cf. Tafsīr, vol.30, p.336 .

3. Text, vol.3, p.297.

i.e. divinely inspired information that Abū Lahab had lost everything, his wealth and his family.¹ Al-Suhaylī in his endeavour to prove his views seems not to be the least hesitant in adopting a reading of a verse different form that in the Muṣḥaf.

Pertaining to the verse in question, the Arabic word tabb, i.e. perish, is used twice in two different senses. It is used first as an appeal, while in the second occurrence it implies the granting of the appeal and its fulfilment by information from God that Abū Lahab was already doomed. According to Qur'ān commentators that was the exact meaning without the addition of the word "qad".²

Al-Suhaylī's views on naskh

With regard to the account of Bi'r Ma^cūna, it is reported in the Sīra that Abū Barā' ^cĀmir ibn Mālik asked the Prophet to provide him with some of his Companions so as to call the People of Najd to the cause of Islām.³ The Prophet provided him with forty men.⁴ When they were at a well called Ma^cūna some of the ^cArab tribes attacked them and they were slain. Al-Suhaylī reported that a Qur'ān was revealed concerning them but later was cancelled. It was: "Inform our people on

1. Text, vol.3, p.298.

2. Cf. al-Ṭabarī, op. cit.

3. According to al-Bukhārī the reason was different; the Arab tribes of Ri^cl, Dhakwan, ^cUṣayya and Banū Lihyān asked the Prophet to provide them with some men to support them against their enemy. See Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-Maghāzī, vol.5, p.287.

4. Their number is seventy according to al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Al-Suhaylī supported them. Text, vol.6, p.201; Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.5, pp.286,288.

our behalf that we have met our Lord. He has been well pleased with us, and has made us pleased". He made a comment to the effect that this speech has nothing of the miraculous style of the Qur'ān. Thus it could be said that it was not revealed in that way but in the same miraculous style. However, Anas is reported in al-Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ as declaring: "There was revealed concerning those slain at Bi'r Ma^cūna a Qur'ānic verse which we recited until it was withdrawn".¹ He then quoted the verse above cited by al-Suhaylī. Attention should be drawn to the fact that this so-called verse appears in a slightly different form as a saying of the Prophet in Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ, narrated by ^cUrwa: When the news of the Muslims who had been killed reached the Prophet. He announced the news of their death saying, "Your Companions (of Bi'r Ma^cūna) have been killed, and they have asked their Lord saying: 'O our Lord! inform our brothers about us that we are pleased with you and you (are pleased) with us'".²

It is noteworthy that in his chapter on naskh, Dr. J. Burton quoted the tradition and the verse above mentioned, though he classified the verse concerning Bi'r Ma^cūna under the subheading of naskh al-ḥukm wa al-tilāwa, i.e. the suppression of both the ruling and the wording, and argued that this type of naskh is "omission". He suggested that the Muslims eschewed use of this word. Perhaps because omission might suggest either negligence or inadvertence.³ Our author does not subscribe to this view. As according to him the substance of this verse is a khabar, i.e. divinely inspired information. And this type of khabar is not subject to naskh *

1. See Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb al-Maghāzī, vol.5, pp.288-89.

2. Ibid. vol.5, p.291.

3. The Collection of the Qur'ān, pp.47-48.

4. Cf. p.99 above.

Thus the information conveyed in the verse was not abrogated; rather it should be regarded as valid. So what was abrogated is the rule applied generally to the Qur'ān, that it is to be recited in prayers, touched only by the pure, written in the Muṣḥaf and learnt as a fard kifāya, i.e. duty that has to be done on behalf of the community. Hence all the verses which are not subject to these rules, should be regarded as abrogated, even so they were preserved in books of traditions. If there is a rule which is involved in such verses it should remain valid, as well as a khabar which should also remain valid. However, the Mu^ctazila denied the validity of the rule.¹

Also instanced by al-Suhaylī is another cancelled verse: "Were Ibn Ādam to possess two valleys of gold he would ask for a third valley, only dust will fill the maw of Ibn Ādam; but God relents to him who repents".² He referred to the variations of reading this verse as it was preserved in books of tradition. It was also recorded: "Never satisfy Man's eye and Man's mouth..."; and instead of 'two valleys of gold', it was recorded as 'valley of property'.³ Al-Suhaylī uses this

-
1. It is the Khawārij who pressed for the exclusive acknowledgement of the penalty of fornication that is mentioned in the Qur'ān "the flogging", and they would have none of the fiqh's stoning penalty, on the grounds that it nowhere appears in the text of the Qur'ān. I found no reference to the Mu^ctazila in this connection. Al-Firaq, pp.314, 337; cf. al-Rāzī, vol.6, p.215; Text, vol.6, p.207.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.207.
 3. This verse was also recorded in a slightly different way; "Were Ibn Ādam to ask for a valley of property and he received it, he would ask for a second, and if he received that, he would demand a third one. Only dust will fill the maw of Ibn Ādam..." See al-Itqān, vol.3, p.73.

verse to emphasise the khabar argument, saying that, likewise the other verse, the central information in this verse was not abrogated, but only the recitation was. Indicating his source as the book of Tafsīr of Ibn Sallām, al-Suhaylī located this verse in Sūrat Yūnus following the verse: "As if it had not flourished only the day before: Thus do we explain the signs in detail for those who reflect" (XVI-24).¹ However the rhyme is different.

With regard to the verse which was abrogated as a recitation while the rule remained valid, our author brought forward the verse of stoning: "The Shaykh and the Shaykha, when they fornicate, stone them al-batta outright, as an exemplary punishment from God, and do not detest your fathers, verily that is infidelity".² He then commented: The rule involved in this verse could have been abrogated too when the verse was cancelled as a recitation. And it was also possible that the recitation could have remained although the rule had been abolished.³ Al-Suhaylī, who appears to have been well aware of the Mu^ctazila's views in this connection may well have been acquainted with the Ash^cariyya's response to their arguments too. He seems to have adopted it, as al-Ghazalī pointed out that it is quite feasible that a ruling be

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.208. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.501.
 2. Mālik's version of this verse stops at "stone them outright". See al-Muwattaʿa, Kitāb al-Ḥudūd, p.391. Al-Bukhārī did not quote the beginning. He started from "Do not detest your fathers". He cited the same account on ^cUmar's authority which was preserved by Ibn Ishāq. See Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.8, p.540. Muslim, who quoted the same tradition did not cite the verse. See Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-Ḥudūd.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.208.

revealed in the Qur'ān, yet the wording subsequently be annulled, leaving the ruling alone valid and vice versa. He reported this to have been the case in the instance of the stoning verse, and other verses such as II-240 and II-184.¹ Ibn Qutayba, who was of the same opinion, asserted that if it is possible to abandon the ruling yet retain the wording in the Muṣḥaf, it is equally possible to abandon the wording, yet retain the ruling in fiqh.² However, our author, who subscribes to this view, introduced his own neat system whereby he used the khabar argument to justify the rule argument. Unfortunately this system seems to raise more difficulties than it solves, because it brings into question the integrity of the Qur'ānic text itself.

In the Sīra text Ibn Ishāq quoted ^cUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, when addressing the people in Medina, as saying: I am about to say to you today something which God has willed that I should say and I do not know whether perhaps it is my last utterance. He who understands and heeds it, let him take it with him wherever he goes; and as for him who fears that he will not heed it, may he not deny that I said it. God sent Muhammad and sent down the scripture to him. Part of what he sent down was the verse on stoning, we read it, we were taught it, and we heed it. The Apostle stoned (adulterers) and we stoned them after him. I fear that in time to come men will say that they find no mention of stoning in God's book and thereby go astray by neglecting an ordinance which God has sent down. Verily, in the book of God is a penalty laid on married men and women who commit adultery, if proof stands

1. Al-Mustasfā, vol.1, pp.123, 124.

2. Kitāb ta'wīl Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth, pp.310-315. cf. The Collection of the Qur'ān, p.96.

or pregnancy is clear¹ or confession is made. Then we read in what we read from the book of God: "Do not desire to have ancestors other than your own for it is infidelity so to do".² The fact that the citation has nothing to do with adultery^{and}, nevertheless Ibn Ishāq left it without comment, makes A. Guillaume suggest that it shows that the verse, of which it is the beginning, was well known in Ibn Ishāq's time.³ However according to most scholars, including our author, that was the end of the verse.⁴ They also hold that the verse is one of those that was afterwards abrogated, while others hold that it was accidentally lost. But al-Zamakhsharī denied this.⁵

-
1. Opinions differ whether pregnancy alone is sufficient to inflict upon an unmarried woman the punishment of stoning. According to ^c Umar it is a sufficient proof. Mālik also held this view. The majority of the jurists do not subscribe to this opinion and assert that mere pregnancy without witnesses or confession on the woman's part cannot establish her offence beyond any shadow of doubt. As the Prophet said: Ward off the punishments as far as you find it possible to ward them off.
 2. Text, vol.7, p.553. cf. Ikhtlāf al-Ḥadīth, margin of al-Umm, vol.7, p.251; al-Ṭabarī, Ta'rīkh, vol.3, p.204. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī under the subheading of rajm of a married lady who has become pregnant through illegal sexual intercourse, vol.8, pp.537-40.
 3. Life of Muḥammad, p.685.
 4. Sūra 33 was suggested for the location of this verse. Guillaume refused this saying that the rhyme forbids it. Ibid.
 5. Al-Kashshāf, vol.3, p.518.

Alfred Guillaume found the stoning verse a most problematic question. He said: There is a real problem which can hardly be satisfactorily solved: on the one hand, the Qur'ān teaches that adulterers must be scourged; on the other hand, this exceeding early tradition - much older than the later canonical collections of Hadīth - that they must be stoned is evidently the authority which lies behind the penalty prescribed by Muslim lawbooks to this day. Following the opinion of Nöldeke, he concluded that; since the words Shaykha and albatta occur nowhere in the Qur'ān and since the first part of the verse appears in a slightly different form as a saying of Muḥammad in Muslim's Ṣaḥīḥ (Imān 27),¹ the probability is that it never formed part of the Qur'ān.² He also questioned the authenticity of the report on ^CUmar's authority, saying: If it is authentic, it remains to be explained why ^CUmar, who was a most truthful man, should have stated publicly in the strongest possible terms that the verse was to be read in the Qur'ān.³ It could also be said; If ^CUmar was speaking about a verse of the Qur'an that was missing from the Muṣḥaf, why did not he include it in the text himself since he was the caliph at the time and the ultimate authority? To these two questions answered the author of Kitāb al-Mabānī,⁴ who commented on ^CUmar's Hadīth, saying: ^CUmar is supposed to have been afraid of being

-
1. Probably he meant the last part of the verse as the tradition he referred to is thus: "Abū Hurayra narrated that the Prophet said: "Do not detest your fathers, He who detested his father committed infidelity". See Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, the book of faith, vol.1, p.42.
 2. Life of Muḥammad, p.685 cf. Nöldeke-Schwally, Gesch. d. Qorans, 1.248-251 as quoted by Guillaume op.cit.
 3. Guillaume, op. cit.
 4. Al-Mabānī, pp.79-80. cf. The Collection of the Qur'ān, pp.100-102.

accused of adding to the book of God.¹ One would not employ the term "adding" when speaking of what is recognised as authentically Qur'ānic. Stoning was, in ^CUmar's view, an attested sunna, and hence an essential Islamic ruling...²

^CUmar feared that there would come after him some who, aware that it is not to be found in the Qur'ān, would repudiate stoning. But, had it been of the Qur'ān, ^CUmar would have recorded it, without heed to what might be said, since he would have had no excuse for leaving it out. Besides, if it really was the Qur'ān, the people would not say that it was not. What ^CUmar feared was to record in the Qur'ān something that was not Qur'ān. He would then be justly accused of adding to the Qur'ān. His aim was to establish, not that stoning was Qur'ān, but that it was a divine imposition. That is shown by his speaking of entering it in the margin, as opposed to in the corpus of the text.³ His argument seems logical and convincing.

From what has been said it is obvious that stoning is more than likely to be a sunna, particularly in view of what Nöldeke concluded after examining the so-called stoning verse, besides the multitude of narrations that adulterers were stoned at the time of the Prophet. However, it is the Ash^Cariyya who approved of this type of naskh (naskh al-tilāwa dūn al-ḥukm). Thus our author was merely following

-
1. ^CUmar was quoted in many books as saying: By him who holds my soul in His hand! but that men would say, ^CUmar has added to the book of God! I would write it in with my own hand, 'The Shaykh and the Shaykha,...' See for instance al-Muwatta', Kitāb al-Ḥudūd p.391; Fath, vol.12, p.129; al-Mabānī, p.79.
 2. Al-Mabānī, p.80.
 3. Al-Mabānī, p.80. cf. The Collection of the Qur'ān, p.101.

the opinion of the school to which he belongs.

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

It has been said that al-Suhaylī was taught by Ibn al-^CArabī who was an Ash^Carite theologian and a vigorous opponent of the Zāhirite views prevailing at his time. In this Chapter it is evident that the impact of the Ash^Cariyya on our author can hardly be overestimated, particularly that of al-Ghazālī. This was due to al-Suhaylī's intimacy with Ibn al-^CArabī who in his turn was an intimate pupil and friend of al-Ghazālī. Although al-Suhaylī consciously ignored referring to the Zāhirites, unconsciously he was very much influenced by them but unlike the influence of the Ash^Carites, the Zāhirite influence was on more of a technical basis. This is shown in al-Suhaylī's tendency to employ their methodology, namely the use of language. Thus al-Suhaylī introduced his own lexographical exegesis depending almost entirely on his vast knowledge of Arabic language. It can further be explained by our author's ready acceptance of many traditions such as the account of the Prophet being bewitched. However, the Ash^Cariyya hold the same view. The strongest remark in this instance is his acceptance of the isrā' as having happened twice. Although the tendency to determine the number of incidents by the number of versions of traditions handed down, was described as a methodology of the Zāhirites. Nevertheless they did not use it in this instance but al-Suhaylī did. However he was following the opinion of his teacher, Ibn al-^CArabī.

CHAPTER VII

EMPHASES IN AL-SUHAYLĪ'S COMMENTARY

As he had promised in his introduction to discuss linguistic points, finish any incomplete information, correct an error, add a genealogical note or historical account, throughout his commentary al-Suhaylī made a genuine attempt to fulfil his principles. Hence his Rawḍ abounds with useful discussions on all these various aspects. However, in this chapter the aim is to focus on some of these aspects with special attention to relatively unknown historical accounts, and on some particular questions connected with the Prophet's personality and practice, in many of which al-Suhaylī has introduced his own methodology whereby he attempted to reconcile seemingly contradictory accounts.

HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

The Prophet's meeting with Banū Tha^Claba

With regard to the account of the Prophet offering himself to the tribes, al-Suhaylī added an interesting account which he describes as worthy to be included in his book. It deals particularly with the Prophet offering himself to Banū Dhahl and Banū Shaybān ibn Tha^Claba.¹ Our author quoted the account in part as he said he missed out the meeting of Abū Bakr with Daghfal ibn Ḥanzala² and quoted what comes after.³

1. See Jamhara, p.321.

2. Daghfal was renowned as a genealogist. Opinions differ whether he had met the Prophet or not. Al-Ishtiqāq, p.355, n.4, al-Iṣāba; vol.1, p.475; al-Qālī, vol.3, p.25.

3. Text, vol.4, p.61; cf Abū Nu^Caym, pp.237-9.

The narrator who seems to be ^CAlī ibn Abī Tālib, said: We were then led to another assembly upon which rested calm and dignity, Abū Bakr approached and greeted the people.¹ He then asked: "From which clan are you?" They replied, "From Shaybān ibn Tha^C laba". Abū Bakr then turned to the Prophet and said: "Let my father and mother be sacrificed for you, O Apostle of God, these are the leaders of their people".²

The narrator continues saying: Among them was Mafrūq ibn ^CUmar, Hāni' ibn Qabīṣa, al-Muthannā ibn Hāritha and al-Nu^C mān ibn Sharīk.³ Mafrūq was the most eloquent and handsome of them. He had two plaits of hair falling on his bosom. His seat was the nearest to Abū Bakr, who asked him: "How many are you in number?" Mafrūq answered, "We are more than a thousand and a thousand will not be defeated for want of numbers". Abū Bakr then asked: "How strong are you?" Mafrūq said: "We are required to make every effort and every people have their own level of diligence".⁴ Abū Bakr asked: "How is it between you and your enemy when you confront each other in war?" Mafrūq said: "We are the most enraged when we confront our enemy, and the keenest to confront our enemy when enraged. We prefer horses to sons and arms to camels, but victory is from God, sometimes we win, other times they

-
1. At this point the narrator made a comment to the effect that Abū Bakr was always the first in doing good deeds. Text, vol.4, p.61. The word khayr appeared as hīn in Abū Nu^C aym's text, p.240.
 2. Text, vol.4, p.61; cf Jamhara, p.321; Abū Nu^C aym, p.240.
 3. See al-Ishtiqāq, p.359; Jamhara, p.325.
 4. The word jadd is not vowelled. It could either be jidd or jadd. Thus according to the latter the phrase could be translated: "But there is always an element of luck". Cf. Text, vol.4, p.62.

win, perhaps you are the brother of Quraysh?"¹ Abū Bakr then said: "Did you hear that he is the Apostle of God?" Mafrūq said: "We heard that he mentioned this. What do you proclaim, O brother of Quraysh?" The Apostle then came forward and said: "I invite you to witness that there is no divinity but God alone without any partner and that I am the Apostle of God, and to give me shelter and to protect me because Quraysh stand against the command of God and falsify His Apostle. They are content with falsehood and deny the truth but God is free of all wants, and worthy of all praise". Mafrūq then said: "And what else do you proclaim, O brother of Quraysh?" The Apostle then recited: "Say: 'Come, I will rehearse what God hath (really) prohibited you from': Join not anything as equal with Him; be good to your parents; kill not your children on a plea of want; we provide sustenance for you and for them. Come not nigh to shameful deeds, whether open or secret; take not life, which God hath made sacred, except by way of justice and law: Thus doth He command you, that ye may learn wisdom" (VI-151).²

Mafrūq said: "And what else do you proclaim, O brother of Quraysh?" The Apostle then recited: "God commands justice, the doing of good, and liberality to kith and kin, and He forbids all shameful deeds, and injustice and rebellion: He instructs you, that ye may receive admonition" (XVI-90). Mafrūq then said: "O brother of Quraysh, by God, you have called to noble manners and good deeds. Verily those who falsified you and co-operated against you are liars." And as if he wanted Hāni' ibn Qabiṣa to participate, he said: "And this is Hāni' ibn Qabiṣa our chief and our religious leader".³ Then Hāni' said: "I have heard what you said, O brother of Quraysh, but I think if we abandoned our religion to follow

1. Text, vol.4, pp.61-62.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p.63.

yours after just one meeting you have held with us will be lapse of good sense and lack of consideration for the consequences; and always with haste comes error. We also have some people and we dislike to make any commitment on their behalf without asking their opinion. So you go back and we will go back too and you think and we will think." And as if he wanted al-Muthannā to participate, he said: "And this is al-Muthannā ibn Hāritha our chief and our military leader." Al-Muthannā then said: "I have heard what you said, O brother of Quraysh, and the reply is the same reply of Hānī' ibn Qabiṣa as he said concerning abandoning our religion and following yours after just one meeting will be without a beginning or an end, and we are only people who sojourned between the two Ṣaryān of Yamama and Samāwa".¹ The Prophet asked: "What are these Ṣaryān?" He said: "The rivers of Chosroes and the waters of the Arabs. For anyone from the rivers of Chosroes any mistake is not forgivable and any apology is not acceptable, for one from the waters of the Arabs apology is acceptable and error is forgivable. But we have only stayed there under a covenant from Chosroes not to innovate or to give shelter to an innovator and I think that what you have invited us to is something abhorred by kings. But if you like we can give you shelter and protect you from those of the waters of the Arabs." The Apostle then said: "That was not a bad reply and moreover you have been frank with me and you told me the truth. But the religion of God will not be defended but by those who all can defend it from all sides. Do you consider if you remain for a short time and God made you heirs of their lands and their goods and their women, would you praise God and exalt him?" Al-Nu^cmān ibn Sharīk then said: "To God this is due". The Apostle then recited: "Truly we have sent thee as a witness, a Bearer of Glad Tidings, and a warner. And as one who invites to God (grace)

1. Text, vol.4, pp.61-63. of al-Nihāya, vol.3, pp.28, 66.

by His leave, And as a lamp spreading light" (XXXIII-45-46). This last verse is now in Sūrat al-Ahzāb which was revealed in Medina on the occasion of the battle of the Trench in the 5th year A.H. and the account was supposed to be about two years before the migration to Medina (after Abū Tālib's death three years before the Hijra).¹

The narrator of the account, who seemed to be ^CAlī ibn Abī Tālib, said: Then the Apostle stood up and said: "O Abū Bakr, O Abū Ḥasan, How noble are the manners of Jāhiliyya, by means of it God deflects the vengeance of one group from the other and by it they withhold one from the other". The narrator said: Then we were led to an assembly of Aus and Khazraj who swore allegiance to the Apostle and they were the Most truthful and steadfast in hardship".²

It should be noted that ^CAlī was not married at that time. Thus this last comment on the manners of Jāhiliyya seemed to be added later, as he called him Abū Ḥasan. Particularly Abū Nu^Caym who preserved the whole account did not have this last remark on the manners of Jāhiliyya.³ Though there is nothing else to suggest that this account was not authentic, however it was not mentioned either by Ibn Ishāq or by Ibn Hishām. Although al-Suhaylī's account goes parallel to that of Abū Nu^Caym,⁴ it was not likely to be his source as he mentioned Qāsim ibn Thābit in connection with this account.⁵ Abū Nu^Caym stated the authority as Ibn ^CAbbās from ^CAlī ibn Abi Tālib.

1. Text, vol.4, pp.63-64.

2. Ibid., p.64.

3. Abu Nu^Caym, p.242.

4. Ibid., pp.236-242.

5. Text, vol.4, p.60. cf pp.37-8;53-4 abpve.

Pertaining to the Prophet's mission to foreign rulers

Al-Suhaylī quoted the speeches of the messengers sent by the Prophet to kings and rulers at the time. Apparently what al-Suhaylī quoted are messages given by word of mouth and not the written letters sent by the Prophet. For instance, he quoted the address of Dihya ibn Khalīfa to Caesar. "O Caesar I have been sent to you by somebody who is better than you, who, in his turn, was sent by the one who is better than you and himself. So listen in humility and answer sincerely, because if you do not humble yourself you will not understand and if you do not answer sincerely you will not be just". Caesar then asked him to speak out. The former said: "Do you know that Jesus used to pray?" "Yes", answered Caesar. Dihya then said: "I am inviting you (to worship) the one to whom Jesus used to pray and to Him who maintained heavens and earth while Jesus was in his mother's womb. I am inviting you to the (gentile) ummi Prophet whose coming was predicted by Moses,¹ and so did Jesus after him. You have already sufficient knowledge about Him, so that you do not need to seek proof" (an allusion to the verses in the Bible predicting the coming of a Prophet). Dihya continued: "If you respond positively it will be well with you in this world and in the next. Otherwise you will lose the life to come and share your power in this life. You also have to know that God who created you is capable of the destruction of the mighty and the turning of fortune against whom He wishes".² Caesar then took the letter (of the Prophet) put it on his eyes and then on his head. Finally he kissed it and said: "I have read all books and consulted all learned men and found nothing but good. So

1. Text, vol.7, p.516. It is worth remarking that a contemporary scholar speculated that Moses' Prophecy; Deuteronomy, 18:15, 18, applies to none but the Prophet Muhammad, Muhammad in World Scriptures, vol.2, pp.480-510.

2. Text, vol.7, pp.516-517.

allow me time to think about who it was to whom Jesus used to pray, because it will certainly harm my position to give you an opinion today and tomorrow have a better one to substitute for it".¹ Al-Suhaylī went on to say that Caesar inclined to Islam. He thus gathered his people and declared to them that he had become a follower of Muḥammad. On seeing their vigorous reaction he was forced to tell them that he had only aimed to see how firm they were in their beliefs. Nevertheless he wrote a letter to the Prophet informing him that he had become a Muslim but had been overpowered by his people. Along with his letter he also sent presents to the Prophet, who remarked on reading the letter: "The enemy of God is merely telling a lie, he did not become a Muslim but is still a Christian".² Al-Suhaylī added that Caesar kept the Prophet's letter in a casket made of gold and it was kept in his family till it came to Alphonso of Spain who left it to his nephew. Al-Suhaylī was regarded as the earliest authority for the location of the Prophet's letter to Caesar.³

However al-Suhaylī stated that Dihya was sent to Caesar in the year 9 A.H. from Tabūk.⁴ On the other hand, according to Ibn Saʿd, Dihya was sent to Caesar in the year 6 A.H. which is not likely. He also alleged that Dihya did not deliver the Prophet's letter personally to Caesar. But he delivered it to the ruler of Buṣrā who in his turn delivered it to Caesar.⁵ Al-Suhaylī's version is similar to that of al-Ṭabarī who preserved this account in much more detail on the authority of Ibn Ishāq.⁶ Thus al-Ṭabarī was the likely source of our author or more probably al-Suhaylī quoted this account from the

1. Text, vol.7, p.517.

2. Ibid., pp.363-364. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.259.

3. Text, vol.7, p.365. cf. Muslim Studies, p.328.

4. Text, vol.7, p.363.

5. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.259.

6. Ta'rikh, vol.2, p.644. cf. Life of Muḥammad, pp.652-659.

version of Yūnus. Ibn Hishām must have omitted this account for the purpose of reducing the Sīra.¹

* * * * *

Another messenger sent by the Prophet was Ḥaṭīb ibn Abī Balṭa^c to the Maqawqis, ruler of Alexandria, whom al-Suhaylī named as Jurayj ibn Mīnā. Ḥaṭīb addressed him saying, "Verily a man before you had alleged that he was the supreme Lord, but God smote him with the scourge of the life to come and that of this life as well.² So take warning from others and let not the others take warning from you". The Maqawqis then asked Ḥaṭīb to speak out. Ḥaṭīb said, "You have a religion that you will not leave but for a better one, which is Islam. This religion which invites people to worship God alone and none beside Him. This Prophet came forth inviting people to it but Quraysh were the most harsh opponents of him and the Jews, his bitter enemies. But nearest to him were the Christians. Verily Moses' prediction of Jesus is no different from Jesus' prediction of Muḥammad and our inviting you to the Qur'an is no different from your inviting the people of the Torah to the Bible. People are commanded to obey the Prophets sent at their time as the presence of anyone at the time of a Prophet makes him one of his community and you are one of these people who were preached to by this Prophet - We are not asking you to give up Jesus's religion, but we are inviting you to it".³ The Maqawqis answered him saying: "I have thought about this Prophet and I found that he always commanded something which was desirable and never forbade anything but that which was abhorred, and I did not find him to be a deluded sorcerer or a lying soothsayer. I also found

1. Cf. Life of Muḥammad, p.653, footnote 3.

2. This is an allusion to verse 24-25 of Sūrat al-Nazī^cāt (LXXIX), where Pharaoh was meant.

3. Text, vol.7, p.518.

with him the token of Prophecy, the bringing of light to what is hidden and the one who tells secret councils". He also asked Ḥaṭīb to give him time to think.¹ Al-Suhaylī added that the Maqawqis then sent as a present to the Prophet, Mary, daughter of Sham^cūn, the Mother of Ibrāhīm, the Prophet's son, and her sister, Sīrīn, the mother of ^cAbd al-Rahmān ibn Hassan ibn Thābit. He also sent him a slave boy called Ma'būr, a mule called Duldul, garments and a cup made of glass, out of which the Prophet used to drink.² According to al-Wāqidī, the Maqawqis had information from al-Mughira ibn Shu^cba about the Prophet before he received his letter.³ Ibn Sa^cd stated that he did not embrace Islam.⁴

* * * * *

Another messenger sent by the Prophet was al-^cAlā' ibn al-Ḥadramī^{who} was sent to al-Mundhir ibn Sāwa (ruler of al-Bahrayn). He addressed him saying: "O Mundhir you are a man of great intellect in this world, so do not belittle yourself in the world to come. This Magianism is the worst of all religions. It neither has the dignity of the ^cArab nor the knowledge of the people of the book. The Magians marry those whom others would feel ashamed of marrying, eat what others find disgusting to eat, and worship in this world a fire that will consume them in the world to come. You do not lack reason or opinion so listen: Is it reasonable to disbelieve someone who never lies, not to trust someone who never deceives and to distrust someone who never goes back on his promises. If that is not so, this gentile Prophet is one about whom no reasonable person can say: I wish he forbade what he commanded or commanded what he forbade, or I wish he never increased his

-
1. Text, vol.7, p.518.
 2. Ibid., p.519. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.260.
 3. Text, vol.7, p.518, n.2.
 4. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.260.

forgiveness or decreased his punishment. All of that is in accordance with the wishes of intelligent people".¹ Al-Mundhir answered: "I have considered my religion and found it to be concerned only with this world, whereas considering yours I found it for this life and the life to come and nothing will prevent me from accepting a religion which fulfils the desires of this world and assures a peaceful death. While yesterday I was astonished by those who accept it, now I am astonished by those who reject it. It is part of showing respect to the one who brought it forth to show respect to his messenger, and I shall see".²

According to Ibn Sa^c d, al-Mundhir accepted Islam and sent to the Prophet to that effect. He also informed him that he had Magians and Jews in his land. The Prophet sent to him to invite them to Islam. If they rejected it, they should pay jizya.³

As has been mentioned, our author was certainly looking at another version of the sīra when commenting on this account, i.e. the Prophet's missions to ^cArab and foreign rulers. He said: It occurred in the sīra in this account that the Prophet said to al-^cAlā': "If they ask you about the key to paradise say: Its key is: There is no divinity but God".⁴ This account and others on the same occasion showed that Ibn Hisham had greatly compressed this chapter. It has been suggested that al-Suhaylī might have quoted it from Yunus' version. However he commented on it saying: There is an account in al-Bukhārī to the effect that it was said to Wahb: "Is it true that the key of paradise is saying, No divinity but God". He said, "Yes, but no key is without teeth. If you have

1. Text, vol.7, pp.519, 520.

2. Ibid., p.520.

3. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.263.

4. Text, vol.7, p.520.

a key with teeth it will open otherwise it will not". When Ibn ^CAbbās heard that he said: "Wahb was telling the truth and I will tell you about the teeth to which he alluded: It is prayer, alms, etc." Al-Suhaylī added that Ibn ^CAbbās mentioned all the pillars of Islam.¹

* * * * *

Another messenger sent by the Prophet was ^CAmr ibn al-^CĀs. According to al-Suhaylī he was sent to al-Julundī (ruler of ^CUmān), while according to Ibn Hishām,² al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Sa^Cd, to his two sons.³ He addressed him saying: "O Julundī, if you are far away from us you are not far from God. The one who created you alone deserves to be worshipped alone and it is not right to associate with him anyone who was not associated with him in bringing you to life. You also have to know that He who gives you life can take it away and He who created you in the first place can bring you back to life. So consider this gentile Prophet who has brought forth (the good) of this life and life to come. If he wants a reward from you, do not give it to him, and if he is ruled by desire leave him. Then consider what he has brought forth, is it similar to what others bring? If that is so ask him for proof. If not accept what he says and fear what he threatens".⁴ Al-Julundī said: "By God what is proof to me that he is a prophet is that whenever he commands something good, he is the first to do it and whenever he forbids something evil he is the first to leave it. When he defeats (his enemies) he does not boast and when he is defeated he does not become impatient. He keeps his

1. Text, vol.7, p.520.

2. Ibid., p.465.

3. According to al-Ṭabarī, Jayfar and ^CAbbād, Ibn Sa^Cd, Jayfar and ^CAbd, Ibn Hishām, Jayfar and ^CAyyād. Ta'rikh, vol.2, p.645; Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.262.

4. Text, vol.7, p.521.

promises and fulfils his duties. I witness that he is a Prophet".¹ However according to Ibn Sa^cd, it was the two sons of al-Julundī who accepted Islam.² Ibn Hajar tried to reconcile different reports. He said: It is possible that the letter was sent to al-Julundī but he left the decision to his two sons.³

* * * * *

Shujā^c ibn Wahb was sent to Jabala ibn al-Ayham (ruler of Ghassān). He addressed him saying: "O Jabala, you know that your people (i.e. the Ansār) helped this Prophet move from his own land to theirs. They gave him shelter and protected him. This religion which you are following is not the religion of your fathers but you became governor of al-Shām and neighbour of the Rūm. If you had become neighbour of Chosroes you would have certainly followed the religion of the Persians to please the king of ^cIrāq. This Prophet has been acknowledged by one of your religion to whom if preference is given to him over you, it will not make you angry, and if preference is given to you over him it will not make you happy. If you accept Islam, the people of Shām will be obedient to you and the Romans will dread you. If they did not, it may be well with them in this world but you will have the world to come. You will also substitute mosques for churches, adhān for bell, Friday for Sundays and qibla for the cross and you will be granted what God has promised which is better and everlasting."⁴ Jabala answered him saying: "I wish ~~Jabala~~ that people were unanimous about this gentile Prophet as they are unanimous about the creation of the Heavens and the earth. I am pleased that my people supported him and also

-
1. Text, vol.7, p.521. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, pp.262, 263.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Al-Iṣāba, vol.1, p.264, but cf. al-Wathā'iq, p.128.
 4. Text, vol.7, p.522.

pleased that he killed the pagans as well as the Jews and left the Christians unharmed. Caesar had commanded me to fight against his Companions at Mu'ta, I refused. He commanded Mālik ibn Nāfila of Sa^cd al-^cAshira but God killed him. What draws me to this Prophet is more than what holds me back from him - I shall see".¹ According to Ibn Sa^cd and our author Jabala accepted Islam but later reverted to Christianity at the time of ^cUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.² Although Professor Watt said that Jabala was said (wrongly) to have become a Muslim,³ he used the story of his reversion to Christianity to illustrate the recognition of the equality of all members of the community in Islam.⁴

* * * * *

Among the messengers of the Prophet was al-Muhājir ibn Abī Umayya who was sent to al-Hārith ibn al-Kulāl (ruler of Yaman). He addressed him saying: O Hārith you are the first one whom the Prophet offered himself to but you missed him while you are the greatest of kings. If you consider the power of kings, remember the one who has power over them. If you are content with your state today, fear what will come tomorrow. Verily before you, there were kings who lived for a long time and had great ambitions. They all perished, nothing remained but the information about them.

"I am inviting you to the Lord who, if you seek guidance will not prevent you and if He wanted to harm you none can help you against Him. I am also inviting you to this gentile Prophet who has nothing as good as what he commands and nothing as bad as what he forbids. Know that you have

-
1. Text, vol.7, pp.522, 523.
 2. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.265. cf. Text, vol.7, p.522.
 3. Muḥammad at Medina, p.113.
 4. Ibid., p.268.

a Lord Who causes the living to die and raises the dead, Who knows that which deceives with the eyes, and all that the hearts (of men) conceal.¹ (A reference to verse XL-19). Al-Hārith answered him saying: "This Prophet offered himself to me but I missed him. He is now a blessing for those who accepted him. His affair was the first of its kind at the time and it seemed without prospects for me. Moreover, I have had no kinship with the Prophet to tolerate him for it and no desire to follow him. Now I can clearly see that this matter was not inspired or supported by falsehood. Those who follow it will certainly benefit from it".²

These accounts were not recorded in any other source available. However al-Suhaylī in one place stated his source as Wathīma ibn Mūsā ibn al-Furāt and it was the likely source of the other accounts. Ibn Ḥajar, who alluded to one account, stated that Wathīma recorded this account on the authority of Ibn Ishāq.³

* * * * *

Stating his source as Abū ^cUbayd (al-Qāsim), al-Suhaylī quoted the Prophet's letter to Ukaydir of Dūmat al-Jandal:

"In the name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful. From Muhammad the Apostle of God, with Khālīd ibn al-Walīd the sword of God, to Ukaydir of Dūmat al-Jandal and its

1. Text, vol.7, p.523.

2. Ibid. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.1, p.264.

3. See al-Iṣāba, vol.1, p.262. Wathīma was a scholar from Basra. He wrote a Kitāb al-Ridda, (d.237) Irshād, vol.7, pp.225-6.

surroundings, on accepting Islam and repudiating idols.¹

"For us will be the uncultivated and the uninhabited land, besides horses, mules, donkeys and arms. For you will be your inhabited land and all palm trees. Your cattle will not be hindered from pasturing anywhere. Your straying cattle will not be counted when taking alms, provided that you perform prayer when it is due and give alms according to the rules. This is a covenant laid upon you by God and to you loyalty and fulfilment is due. God witnessed this and those who are present from the Muslims".²

Al-Suhaylī explained that the Prophet took part of the land and arms from the people of Dūmat al-Jandal, while he did not follow the same practice with the people of al-Tā'if, because he overpowered the former as he took their king as captive. The latter came in repentance and submitted without fighting. He added: If the Prophet had fought and defeated them like those of Khaybar, he would have certainly taken all their properties and given it to the Muslims. Moreover he would have had the option to execute or leave them. But if they had come to him in repentance, he would not have taken any of their properties.³ This was also the opinion of Abū ^cUbayd.⁴

The Sack of Medina

Jābir ibn ^cAbd Allāh said of the camel given to him by

-
1. Professor Watt, who quoted two versions of this treatise, argued that the person to whom this letter was written was not a Muslim, Muḥammad at Medina, p.364. cf. p.42. cf. al-Amwāl, p.253; Futūh al-Buldān, p.83; al-Iṣāba, vol.1, pp.125-7.
 2. Text, vol.7, pp.362-3; al-Amwāl, pp.252-4; Futūh al-Buldān, p.82.
 3. Text, vol.7, p.363.
 4. Al-Amwāl, p.254.

the Prophet that: It continued to thrive till it was lost in the misfortune which befell Medina.¹ Al-Suhaylī seized the opportunity to extend the material on the sack of Medina, i.e. the battle of al-Harra, which took place during the reign of Yazīd ibn Mu^cāwiya under the leadership of Muslim ibn ^cUqba al-Murri. Our author explained the cause of the fight, saying: The people of Medina repudiated the pledge of Yazīd and expelled Marwān ibn al-Hakam and all Banū Umayyā out of Medina² and agreed upon a new governor, ^cAbd Allāh ibn Hanzala. But all the great Companions of the Prophet disagreed with that act. Al-Bukhārī narrated: When the people of Medina wanted to repudiate the pledge of Yazīd, ^cAbd Allāh ibn ^cAbbās called all his sons and mawālī and told them not to join the people, otherwise that would be the end of their relationship. He then confined himself to his house and so did Abū Sa^cīd al-Khudrī. On the day of Harra, some of Yazīd's army entered Abū Sa^cīd's house and asked him for money. When he told them others who had come before them had already taken it, they called him a liar and pulled his beard, and they took everything they found, even a pair of pigeons. It was also said that Jābir ibn ^cAbd Allāh went out that day - while houses were being robbed he could not walk through the dead bodies. He said: "Woe to those who frightened the Apostle of God". One of them asked him: "Who have frightened the Apostle of God?" Jābir said: "I heard the Prophet saying: Whoever frightens Medina frightens me". They attacked him so as to kill him, but Marwān interfered and stopped them, and took Jābir to his house. Those who were killed on that day amongst the Anṣār and the Muhājirūn were one thousand and seven hundred, together with a further ten thousand from other people, not including women and

1. Text, vol.6, p.226.

2. They also expelled the governor appointed by Yazīd; ^cUthmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Sufyān. cf. Ta'rikh, vol.5, p.482; Ibn Khayyāt, vol.1, p.289.

children.¹

It was also mentioned that one of the women of the Anṣār was suckling her baby when one of Yazīd's men (people of al-Shām) entered upon her, when everything in her possession was already taken, he threatened to kill her and her child if she did not give him gold. She said to him: "If you kill him know that his father is Abū Kabsha, the Companion of the Prophet, and I am one of those women who gave the pledge to the Prophet and I have never been disloyal to God or His Apostle". The man then took the baby from her lap while her breast was still in his mouth and he smote him against the wall till his brain was scattered over the ground. All the while the woman was saying: "O my son, I wish I had anything that I could sacrifice for you". The man did not leave her house but his face was blackened and he became an example.²

Our author criticised this saying: I suggest that this woman was the grandmother of the child not his mother. This is because it is unlikely that she gave pledge to the Prophet and at the time of Ḥarra she was still in the age of those who suckled. He also added that this Ḥarra was known as Harrat Zuhra and it was reported in a tradition that the Prophet stopped there and said: "The best men in my nation after my Companions will be killed in this place". He also specified the date as the year sixty three A.H. as did al-Ṭabarī.³

-
1. The number seems to have been exaggerated as according to Ibn Khayyāt, the total number of those who were killed from Quraysh and the Anṣār was three hundred and six. He preserved a list of their names. See Ibn Khayyāt, vol.1, pp.289-314.
 2. Text, vol.6, pp.253-255.
 3. Ibid., p.255; Ta'rīkh, vol.5, p.482; Ibn Khayyāt, vol.1, p.289.

Our author then concluded as if trying to find excuse for Yazīd, saying: It was said that Yazīd tried hard to draw them over to his side and increased their wages, he gave them double what he gave other people. He also warned them against disagreement. But God did what He wanted and He will judge between them in their quarrel. Al-Suhaylī then quoted: "That was a people that hath passed away. They shall reap the fruit of what they did, and you of what you do. You shall not be asked about what they did" (II-134).

This suggests that right up to al-Suhaylī's time the people were still disputing what had happened during Banū Umayya's reign. In particular al-Wāqidī's Kitāb al-Harra was in circulation as al-Suhaylī stated - and it was the likely source of our author. His conclusion summed up his argument: whether or not those people were righteous or not, we are not answerable for what they did - since, on the day of judgement, everyone is required to account for his own deeds.¹ Thus he emphasised the doctrine of personal responsibility.

Although our author criticised this account with regard to the mother of the child, he did not say anything about his father, who was said to be Abū Kabsha. Among the Companions of the Prophet, Ibn Sa^cad mentioned two by that kunya. One of them whose name was Sulaym, was also a mawla of the Prophet, but he died in the year 13 A.H.² The other one was only described as being present with the Prophet during Tabūk; however, he was not likely to be the one mentioned in the account as Ibn Sa^cad mentioned him among those who later went to reside in al-Shām.

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.255. See Ibn Khaldūn, vol.1, p.181; Ṭālibī, vol.2, p.477.
 2. Tabaqāt, vol.3, p.49.

Al-Suhaylī's focus on some aspects of the Prophet's personality and practice

How the Prophet dealt with a hostile Qurashite

Our author recorded the response of some Qurashites to the call to prayer on the day of the conquest of Mecca. It was reported that the Prophet ordered Bilāl to call the people to prayer. At that time ^CAttāb ibn Asīd was sitting in the courtyard of the Ka^Cba with some men. On hearing Bilāl he said God has honoured Asīd - i.e. his father - in not letting him hear this, for it would have enraged him.¹ Another man was al-Hārith ibn Hishām² who was present with ^CAttāb and was asked, "Don't you see what Muḥammad is doing, breaking our idols and letting this black slave, i.e. Bilāl, call from the top of the Ka^Cba?" Thereupon he answered, "If God dislikes this he will change it".³ According to another version he said, "I wish I had died before this day, before hearing Bilāl calling like an ass from the top of the Ka^Cba".⁴ However these remarks apparently contradict Ibn Sa^Cd's account, who said that both men became Muslims on the day of the conquest;⁵ although al-Suhayli himself added that they eventually accepted Islam he did not specify the time. He also added that al-Hārith died as a martyr⁶ while according to Ibn Sa^Cd he died

-
1. ^CAttāb was appointed by the Prophet governor of Mecca after the conquest when the Prophet left for Ḥunayn, and he led the pilgrimage that year, i.e. 8 A.H. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.446. cf. Text, vol.7, pp.76, 136.
 2. Al-Hārith fought at Ajnadayn and remained in al-Shām until his death in the year 18 A.H. during the reign of ^CUmar. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.444.
 3. Text, vol.7, p.137.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, pp.444, 446.
 6. Text, vol.7, p.137.

in the plague of ^cAmwās.¹

One of the Qurashite women, al-Hanfā', daughter of Abū Jahl, on hearing Bilāl saying, "I witnessed that Muḥammad is the Messenger of God", said, "Verily God has honoured you and exalted your name", referring to the Prophet. When she heard Bilal saying, "Come to prayer", she said, "As for prayer we will perform it but by God our hearts dislike killing our beloved ones". She added, "Verily this matter is true, as the angel had come to my father with it but he disliked differing with his people and abandoning his fathers' religion".² For this interesting account al-Suhaylī did not indicate his source. Similarly there was an account concerning some Qurashite young men, one of them called Abū Maḥdhūra al-Jumāhī, who reacted differently on hearing Bilāl. They started repeating what he said in a sarcastic way. Abū Maḥdhūra had an excellent voice, so he repeated the adhān loudly. When the Prophet heard him he ordered that he should come before him. He then came thinking that he was going to be killed. The Prophet passed his hand over his head and chest and he taught him the adhān and ordered him to call to prayer in Mecca while he was only sixteen years of age. He remained in that job till he died and his descendants took over.³ He said: "By God, when the Prophet put his hand on my chest, my heart filled with faith and I knew that he was the Messenger of God".⁴ Al-Suhaylī, in providing such material, highlights some characteristics of the Prophet, introducing some other personalities involved, and reproduces some accounts in the sīra in a lively fashion.

1. Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.444.

2. Text, vol.7, p.138.

3. Ibid. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, p.234; vol.5, p.445.

4. Text, vol.7, p.138; cf. al-Isti^cāb on the margin of al-Iṣāba, vol.4, pp.179-80.

How the Prophet dealt with the Jewish woman who poisoned him

In the account concerning the Jewish woman who offered the Prophet a poisoned sheep after the battle of Khaybar, al-Suhaylī quoted Ibn Ishāq who said that the Prophet forgave her.¹ He also quoted Abū Dā'ūd who said that he killed her,² while another scholar, Abū Sa^cīd al-Nīsābūrī, in his book entitled Sharaf al-Muṣṭafā, recorded a tradition to the effect that the Prophet actually killed and crucified her. On the authority of al-Zuhrī he quoted Ma^cmar ibn Rāshid in his collection of traditions to the effect that this woman became a Muslim and the Prophet forgave her. But Ma^cmar himself commented on this tradition, saying that although al-Zuhrī said this, the general opinion is that the Prophet killed her and that she did not embrace Islam.³

After this exposition of different opinions on the subject, al-Suhaylī, following his method of reconciling apparently contradictory traditions,⁴ said: The only way to combine these different views is to say that the Prophet forgave her first, as he never avenged what befell him personally, but when Bishr ibn Barā'⁵ died as a result of eating the poisoned sheep, he killed her. This view was quoted by Ibn al-Qayyim as a way to reconcile different reports, although he omitted to mention al-Suhaylī.⁶

Although it is unlikely that the Prophet forgave her and

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.512.
 2. Sunan, vol.4, p.244.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.571. cf. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.140.
 4. See p.237 above.
 5. A Companion of the Prophet who fought at Badr, Uhud, al-Khandaq and al-Ḥudaybiya. The Prophet appointed him leader of Banū Salama. Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, p.571.
 6. Text, vol.6, p.571. cf. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.140.

then punished her, there is a tradition to lend support to al-Suhaylī's view, as according to Ibn Sa^cd the Prophet handed her over to the family of Bishr ibn Barā' who killed her.¹ He commented, after stating this tradition saying: This is the authentic tradition in this connection.² However it should be noted that Bishr felt ill for a whole year after that incident until he died,³ while according to another report he died instantly.⁴ Perhaps the Prophet handed the woman over to his family immediately as a captive but when Bishr died they killed her. Al-Suhaylī named the woman as Zaynab, daughter of al-Hārith ibn Salām,⁵ and added that the Prophet himself suffered from the piece he ate at Khaybar. It was related that he used to say in the ailment in which he died, "I still feel the pain caused by the food I ate at Khaybar, and now at this time I feel as if my aorta is being cut by that poison".⁶ Al-Zuhri used this tradition to prove that the Prophet died as a martyr.⁷

Why the Prophet's ordered the punishment of the ^cUranites

Ibn Ishāq asserted that the Prophet forbade mutilation. Al-Suhaylī commented that the tradition was regarded as trustworthy by scholars of Hadīth. He then added; But if it was asked how was it that the Prophet forbade mutilation while he himself mutilated the people from ^cUrayna, as it was reported that he gave his orders for this. So their eyes were gouged and their hands and legs were cut off and they were

-
1. Ṭabaqāt, vol.2, p.202; vol.1, p.172.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Text, vol.6, p.571. cf. Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, p.571.
 4. Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, p.571. cf. al-Istī^cāb, vol.1, p.145.
 5. Text, vol.6, p.571.
 6. Ibid., p.572. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.5, p.510.
 7. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.2, p.140.

left thirsty in the harra till they died in that state.¹ He said: There are two answers for that. First, the Prophet did merely what the ^CUranites themselves did to the shepherds the Prophet provided to them. Second, the prohibition of mutilation was enjoined after this incident. He also pointed out that the Prophet left them thirsty because on that night he and his family were left without milk and the Prophet prayed to God to make thirsty those who made his family thirsty.² However, the way that al-Bukhārī related this tradition gives the impression that the Prophet forbade mutilation after this incident: Qatāda said we were informed that after this happening, the Prophet forbade mutilation³ and used to enjoin the giving of charity. It is worthwhile mentioning here the first part of this account as it was related by al-Bukhārī: Some people of the tribe of ^CUkal and ^CUrayna arrived at Medina to meet the Prophet and embraced Islam, but they found the climate of Medina unsuitable for them. So the Prophet ordered that they should be provided with some milch camels and a shepherd in order to leave Medina. When they reached al-Harra, they reverted to heathenism and killed the shepherd of the Prophet and drove away the camels.⁴

According to al-Tirmidhī who preserved the same account, the Prophet gave his orders. So nails were driven in their eyes but their hands and legs were cut off from opposite sides,⁵ which is understood to mean the right hand and the left foot, and not both feet and hands as could be understood from al-Bukhārī's version. Al-Tirmidhī's account is likely to

-
1. A similar story was reported by Ibn Ishāq in the sīra. See Text, vol.7, p.504. Both accounts seem to refer to the same incident.
 2. Text, vol.6, p.42.
 3. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.5, p.354.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Sunan al-Tirmidhī, vol.1, p.49.

be a record for the application of the verse: "The punishment of those who wage war against God and His Apostle, and strive with might and main for mischief through the land is execution, or crucifixion, or the cutting off of hands and feet from opposite sides, or exile from the land. That is their disgrace in this world, and a heavy punishment is theirs in the hereafter" (V-36). However al-Tirmidhī quoted another tradition to the effect that this incident took place before the prescription of ḥudūd, i.e. specific fixed penalties. Whereas he provided another tradition on Anas' authority, who related this ḥadīth and added that the Prophet pierced their eyes because they pierced the shepherd's¹ eyes. Al-Tirmidhī commented saying that is the meaning of this verse: "Tooth for tooth, and wounds equal for equal" (V-48).

Ibn al-Qayyim asserted that if someone committed a crime for which both law of requital (qiṣāṣ) and prescribed punishment (ḥadd) are due, both should be carried out. In this instance, those people killed and mutilated the shepherd and committed theft. Moreover they apostasised, repudiated Islam and declared war against God and His Apostle. Thus they received both punishments.²

Some signs of prophecy: Suhaylī's treatment

Another example of al-Suhaylī's use of the technique of reconciling conflicting traditions is Ibn Ishāq's report on how the Prophet was protected by God during his childhood. Al-Suhaylī, after pointing out that a somewhat similar story is told of the Prophet's modesty and its preservation by supernatural means, at the time when the rebuilding of the Ka^cba was undertaken when the Prophet was a grown man, says that if the account here is correct, divine intervention

1. Sunan al-Tirmidhī, vol.1, p.49.

2. Zād al-Ma^cād, vol.3, p.78.

must have occurred twice.¹ On this point Guillaume made a suggestion, saying: It may well be that he was led to make this comment by the fact that Ṭabarī omits the story which is in the sīra and in its place he preserves another account - also on the authority of Ibn Ishāq - where the Prophet was reported to have said, "I never gave a thought to what the people of the pagan era used to do but twice, both times God came between me and my desires".² However from what has been mentioned,³ al-Suhaylī was likely to make such a comment without al-Ṭabarī's authority.

Similarly, al-Suhaylī used the same method for the incident of the mountain. It was related that when the Prophet was standing on the mountain of Hira' with some of his Companions, the mountain was shaken. Thereupon the Prophet said, "Be firm O Hira'. Verily standing on you is a Prophet, a companion or a martyr". It was said that with him was Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, Ṭaḥa and al-Zubayr. In another account, however, it was related that the Prophet said precisely, "A Prophet, a companion and two martyrs", referring to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān.⁴ Our author, who found this incident related once as being on the mountain of Uhud and once on Thabīr or Hira', commented that the story was likely to have taken place several times.⁵

The Prophet praying for rain

Al-Suhaylī also highlights some qualities of the Prophet. For instance when he prayed for rain in Mecca his prayer was

-
1. Text, vol.2, p.228.
 2. Life of Muḥammad, p.81. cf. al-Ṭabari, vol.2, p.279. Text, vol.2, p.219.
 3. Cf. pp.237,286 above.
 4. Text, vol.3, p.28. cf. al-Māwardī, p.125.
 5. Text, vol.3, p.29.

answered, but the people came again asking him to pray again for the rain to stop as they were inundated. Instead the Prophet said, "O God let it rain round us, not on us". Al-Suhaylī pointed out how the Prophet was polite in his prayer because rain is a mercy from God, so it is not polite to pray to God asking him to stop his mercy.¹ This tradition is also preserved by al-Bukhārī.²

The Prophet's attitude to poetry

As regards the poetry in which the Prophet was ridiculed by the non-believers, al-Suhaylī decided not to explain any of it except that of those who eventually repented and embraced Islam, such as Dirār and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zibā^c rā.³ He also pointed out that the majority of scholars disapproved of the inclusion of such poetry in the sīra by Ibn Ishāq in the first place. However some excused him, saying that a person does not become a non-believer by reporting the disbelief of another. Moreover, poetry is merely a type of speech and it makes no difference whether you relate the arguments of the non-believers in prose or poetry.⁴ Al-Suhaylī then instances as a proof the Qurʾān itself as it contains the accounts of many arguments between non-believers and the previous prophets. According to him the significance of it is to consider the examples of what happened in the past and to remember the grace of God who sent Prophets to lead mankind out of darkness into light.⁵ Anticipating the arguments of those who hold that the Prophet disapproved of saying poetry, al-Suhaylī quoted a tradition to the effect that the Prophet said: "It is better for one of you to have a maw full of pus than of

1. Text, vol. 3, p.103.

2. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.4, p.505.

3. Text, vol.5, p.73.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

poetry",¹ saying that ^CĀ'isha confined this tradition to poetry in which the writer ridiculed the Prophet and she disapproved of applying it to poetry in general. Thus what was condemned was the filling of the maw of it. Al-Suhaylī, who seems to have been well aware of all arguments involved, quoted Abū ^CUbayd, who rejected this latter view saying: Repeating a hemistich of such poetry is unlawful, then how could the tradition be about filling the maw!² Our author rejected this on the grounds that ^CĀ'isha was more likely to know the explanation. He then concluded that reporting a verse or two of such poetry is no more than reporting arguments in prose.³ However, although it is permissible to narrate it, al-Suhaylī found it abhorrent to discuss it or to explain its meaning.⁴

Our author's opinion concerning the Prophet's attitude to poetry can be supported by other statements recorded on the Prophet's authority. For instance he said: "Some poetry contains wisdom".⁵ It was also reported that he urged Ḥassān to lampoon the non-believers saying: "Lampoon them (in verse) and Gabriel is with you".⁶ Hence the afore-mentioned tradition cannot be taken as a reference to poetry in general and ^CĀ'isha's view was likely to be sounder.

Why the Prophet was called Ibn Abī Kabsha

Concerning the Meccans calling the Prophet "Ibn Abī Kabsha", al-Suhaylī indicated that opinions differ. It was said that the name "Abū Kabsha" was the surname (kunya) of the

1. Text, vol.5, p.73. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.8, p.113.

2. Text, vol.5, p.73.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.8, p.113.

6. Ibid., p.107.

Prophet's grandfather on his mother's side, Wahb ibn ^ʿAbd Manāf.¹ According to others it was the surname of the Prophet's foster father, al-Ḥārith ibn ^ʿAbd al-^ʿUzzā, or a surname of the father of Salma, sister of ^ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. According to al-Suhaylī the most famous version is that the Prophet was called thus, because of the similarity between him and another man by the name of Abū Kabsha, who abandoned the religion of his people and used to worship Sirius.²

Al-Suhaylī did not indicate his source, however, this explanation is likely to be from al-Muḥabbar, though there is a misrepresentation in saying that Salma was the sister of ^ʿAbd al-Muttalib as, according to Ibn Ḥabīb, she was his mother.³ The latter identified the man who worshipped Sirius as Ghubshān Ibn ^ʿAmr Ibn Lu'ayy.⁴

How the Prophet dealt with Khawwāt

Although some material that al-Suhaylī included in his Rawḍ could be regarded as irrelevant at first sight, that was by no means the case, as we will see if we examine the evidence. For instance, Ibn Ishāq mentioned Khawwāt ibn Jubayr as being among those to whom the Prophet gave their share of booty on the day of Badr,⁵ implying that he did not fight.⁶ Al-Suhaylī explained the reason, quoting Mūsa ibn ^ʿUqba as his authority, as being that Khawwāt's leg was hit by a stone, consequently a swelling developed. Thereupon the Prophet ordered him to return from a place called al-Ṣafrā'.⁷

1. Cf. al-Muḥabbar, p.129.

2. Text, vol.4, p.193.

3. Al-Muḥabbar, p.129.

4. Ibid.

5. Text, vol.5, p.268.

6. Ibid., p.293. See Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, p.477; al-Nubalā', vol.2, p.238.

7. Text, vol.5, p.293.

To this point the information al-Suhaylī provided might be sufficient for the sīra reader. Even so, al-Suhaylī further related that once Khawwāt saw some women whose beauty he admired. In order to sit and converse with them, he made a feeble pretext, saying to them that his camel had run away and asking them to make a rope for it. He then sat conversing with them. When the Prophet saw him thus, he turned away from him, though afterwards he asked him smilingly about his runaway camel.¹ However it was disputed whether the event had taken place before Khawwāt became a Muslim or after that. They all agreed that the Prophet was smiling when he asked him. It was likely to be after Khawwāt became a Muslim as it was reported on one of the Prophet's campaigns. The story showed how flexible the nature of the Prophet was. Al-Suhaylī by providing this incident and its like, introduced some relatively unknown characters into the sīra and highlighted some sides of the character of the Prophet himself.

The Prophet's institution of "waḍīma"

Al-Suhaylī sometimes makes short references to the origins of certain practices connected with Islam. For instance, it was recorded in the sīra that when the news came to the Prophet about the death of Ja^cfar ibn Abī Tālib at the battle of Mu'ta, he went out to his family, saying: "Do not neglect Ja^cfar's family so as not to provide them with food, for they are occupied with the disaster that has happened to their lord".² Al-Suhaylī commented: This is the origin of the practice of sending cooked food to a bereaved family to provide a meal for the mourners.³ The Arabs used to call it waḍīma, while they call the food offered on wedding occasions walīma. He also

1. Text, vol.5, p.293.

2. Ibid., vol.7, p.17.

3. Ibid., p.42. cf. al-Umm, vol.1, p.247.

went on to explain what kind of food was made for Ja^Cfar's family, which was ground barley, seasoned with oil and pepper.¹

The wives of the Prophet

Al-Suhaylī elaborated the material concerning the wives of the Prophet. As regards Khadīja, he said she was the wife of ^CAtīq ibn ^CĀ'idh before Abū Hāla and she bore him ^CAbd Manāf while she bore Hind for the latter. Hind died in the epidemic of al-Baṣra.²

^CĀ'isha used to be called Umm ^CAbd Allāh as some narrated a tradition to the effect that ^CĀ'isha miscarried a boy and he was called ^CAbd Allāh. Al-Suhaylī commented that this tradition was reported by Dā'ūd ibn al-Muḥabbar,³ whom scholars of traditions classified as weak. He then referred to another tradition, saying that it was likely to be sounder, that the Prophet told ^CĀ'isha to make her kunya after her nephew's name, that was ^CAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, the son of her sister Asmā'. He used to call her "mother" as she took him in her custody when he was an infant. Our author made a comparison between ^CĀ'isha and Khadīja, then he concluded: Had not the Prophet said: "God has never given me a wife better than Khadīja", ^CĀ'isha could be preferred to her and to all women of the world since there are other traditions to this effect.⁴ Similar is the opinion about Maryam the truthful, i.e. Mary. According to those who hold that she was a prophet herself to whom Gabriel communicated revelation, she should be given preference over all women including ^CĀ'isha and Khadīja as no-one should be preferred before prophets. However, those

1. Text, vol.1, p.42.

2. Ibid., vol.7, p.568. cf. Jamhara, p.210.

3. A traditionist from Baṣra was classified unreliable (d.206 A.H.). cf. Mizān, vol.2, p.20.

4. See Ansāb, vol.1, pp.406, 412-3.

who hold that she was not a prophet hold that ^cĀ'isha and Khadīja are to be preferred to her. All the wives of the Prophet are believed to be preferred to all women of the world,¹ though according to another tradition the Prophet said: "Fātima is the mistress of the women in Paradise except Mary".²

As regards Zaynab, daughter of Jahsh, Ibn Ishāq reported that her brother Abū Ahmad contracted her marriage with the Prophet. Al-Suhaylī remarks that this seemingly contradicts another sound tradition to the effect that Zaynab used to boast to the other wives of the Prophet, saying: "Your families contracted your marriage while God contracted mine from above seven heavens".³ He added that according to yet another tradition, when the verse "Then when Zayd had dissolved (his marriage) with her, we joined her in marriage to thee" (XXXIII-37) was revealed, the Prophet went straight and entered upon her without any permission.

Al-Suhaylī seized the opportunity to draw attention to what at first sight seems to be an error which occurred in a tradition recorded in al-Muwattā' of the jurist, Mālik ibn Anas,⁴ in which it was reported that Zaynab, daughter of Jahsh, was the wife of ^cAbd al-Rahmān ibn ^cAwf.⁵ Al-Suhaylī

1. Text, vol.7, pp.568-569.

2. Ibid., p.570.

3. Ibid., p.571. cf. Ansāb, vol.1, p.435, al-Muḥabbar, p.86.

4. This is a reference to the tradition concerning bleeding as if menstruating: On the authority of Zaynab d. of Abū Salama that she saw Zaynab d. of Jahsh the wife of ^cAbd al-Rahmān ibn ^cAwf, and she used to bleed as if menstruating, she would make ghusl and pray. See al-Muwattā', book of purity 29.

5. Text, vol.4, p.162.

commented that Zaynab, daughter of Jahsh (i.e. the wife of the Prophet), was never married to ^cAbd al-Rahmān, but it was her sister Umm Ḥabīb or Umm Ḥabība according to another version. He further clarified this saying the name of Umm Ḥabīb was Zaynab, whilst the original name of her sister Zaynab was Barra, but the Prophet changed it to Zaynab. Thus there is no error in the tradition recorded in al-Muwattaʿ.¹

Al-Suhaylī added an interesting note, saying: Zaynab daughter of Jahsh, the Prophet's wife asked him to change the name of her father which was Burra. She complained that it signifies something small. Thereupon the Prophet told her that had her father been a Muslim he would give him one of the names of the family of the Prophet, but as he had not, he called him Jahsh² (young ass).

Al-Suhaylī then extended the information to deal with the account concerning Ṣafiyya, the Prophet's wife. Ibn Ishāq reported that when the Prophet conquered the fort of al-Qamūs in Khaybar, he took captives from them, among whom was Ṣafiyya, daughter of Ḥuyayy ibn Akṭab, and two cousins of hers. He chose Ṣafiyya for himself. One of his Companions, Dihya ibn Khalīfa, had asked him for her and when he chose her for himself he gave him her two cousins.³

Al-Suhaylī commented that this tradition apparently contradicts the one on Anas's authority that Ṣafiyya was first taken by Dihya but the Prophet took her from him and gave him seven captives instead⁴ or, according to another version,

1. Text, vol.4, p.163.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., vol.6, p.502. cf. Sharḥ al-Mawāhib, vol.3, p.256.

4. Text, vol.6, p.562. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.721.

her two cousins¹ or one other woman from amongst the captives.² Al-Suhaylī then concluded that the two traditions are not contradictory, as the Prophet took Ṣafiyya from Dihya before the division of the spoils and what he gave to him instead was a present, so it should not be understood that he bought her from Dihya. He rectified this saying: "Although some of the narrators of this tradition added that the Prophet did actually purchase Ṣafiyya from Dihya³ while others said that it happened after the division of the spoils." Finally he added an expression which he rarely uses, "God knows what actually happened".⁵

It is worth remarking that in a sound tradition it was reported that Dihya - before the division of the spoils - came to the Prophet and asked him to bestow upon him a girl out of the prisoners. Thereupon the Prophet permitted him to go and get any girl. Dihya made the choice of Ṣafiyya, daughter of Ḥuṣayy ibn Akḥṭab, the chief of Qurayẓa and the Banū al-Nadīr. When this was brought to the notice of the Prophet, he took her from Dihya, emancipated her and married her.⁶ It was a good gesture from the Prophet who must have decided so to do in the larger interest of Islam and the Muslim society, as marriage, when it was contracted between the members of two tribes, went a long way to burying the hostilities and cementing relations between two hostile tribes. It could also be said that probably the Prophet hoped for more out of that marriage; as on a previous raid when he emancipated and married Juwayriyya, daughter of the chief of Banū al-Muṣṭaliq,

1. Text, vol.6, p.562. cf. p.502.

2. Ibid. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.721.

3. Text, vol.6, p.562.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p.563.

6. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.721. cf. Sharḥ al-Mawāhib, vol.3, p.256.

a hundred families were released because the Muslims regarded them as the Prophet's relations by marriage. ^CĀ'isha said, "I do not know a woman who was a greater blessing to her people than she", referring to Juwayriyya.¹

Al-Suhaylī also rectified the names of three other women said to have been wives of the Prophet and not mentioned by Ibn Ishāq: Sharāf, daughter of Khalīfa, the sister of Dihya ibn Khalīfa al-Kalbī, who died shortly after her marriage.² However, according to another opinion, she died before the Prophet consummated her marriage,³ which is the opinion of Ibn Sa^Cd.⁴ The second one was al-^CĀliya, daughter of Zubayn. According to Ibn Sa^Cd the Prophet divorced her before he consummated the marriage.⁵ The third one mentioned by al-Suhaylī was Wasna, daughter of al-Ṣalt or Sana in another version. She died before the Prophet reached her according to Ibn Sa^Cd.⁶ Al-Suhaylī said that the Prophet divorced her.⁷

AL-SUHAYLĪ'S CRITICAL EMENDATION OF SOME ACCOUNTS

Al-Suhaylī followed his method in his book al-Ta^Crīf wa-al-I^Clām in acquainting the reader with almost all the names that were referred to but left ambiguous. For instance concerning an account about Wahshī when he recognised ^CUbayd Allāh ibn ^CAdī ibn al-Khiyār, he said to him, "By God, I have not seen you since I handed you to your Sa^Cadite mother",⁸ al-Suhaylī commented that was likely to be his foster mother, as

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.406. cf. Sharḥ al-Mawāhib, vol.3, p.254.
 2. Text, vol.7, p.571.
 3. Ibid., p.572. cf. al-Muḥabbar, p.93.
 4. Ṭabaqāt, vol.8, p.160.
 5. Ibid., p.141.
 6. Ibid., p.149.
 7. Text, vol.7, p.571.
 8. Ibid., vol.5, p.432.

his mother was Umm Qitāl, daughter of Abū al-^CAyṣ ibn ^CUmayyah so she was a Qurashite.¹ He indicated his source as Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī where the name is exactly as he said.²

* * * * *

Referring to the account when Waḥshī related how he had killed Musaylima the false prophet of the Yamāma, he said: I made ready for him and so did one of the Anṣār",³ al-Suhaylī, indicating his source as Kitāb al-Ridda of al-Wāqidī, mentioned the name of the man as ^CAbd Allāh ibn Zayd ibn ^CĀsim al-Māzinī.⁴ However, another historian, Sayf ibn ^CUmar, in his book al-Futūḥ, provided the name of the man as ^CAdī ibn Sahl, although Abū ^CUmar al-Namarī said it was Abū Dujāna who shared in the killing of Musaylima.⁵

* * * * *

It was also reported that after the battle of Uḥud, the Prophet asked his Companions who would find out for him what had happened to Sa^Cd ibn al-Rabī^C, whether he was alive or among the dead? Then one of the Anṣār volunteered. Al-Suhaylī defined this man as Muḥammad ibn Maslama, whereas Abū ^CUmar al-Namarī specified him as Ubay ibn Ka^Cb.⁶ But al-Suhaylī relied more on al-Waqidī.⁷

* * * * *

-
1. Text, vol.5, p.459.
 2. See Ṣaḥīḥ, vol.5, p.275.
 3. Text, vol.5, p.434.
 4. Ibid., p.461.
 5. Al-Isti^Cāb, vol.4, p.59.
 6. Ibid., vol.2, p.34.
 7. Text, vol.6, p.40. cf. Maghāzī, vol.1, p.292.

Regarding the names of those who fought at Badr, Ibn Hishām added the names of some men that Ibn Ishāq seemed to have forgotten. He mentioned ^CIyād ibn Abī Zuhayr¹ among banū al-Hārith ibn Fihri. Al-Suhaylī corrected this saying it was Ibn Zuhayr, not Ibn Abī Zuhayr, but it was not Ibn Ishāq's error as he mentioned him correctly as being among the emigrants to Abyssinia.² He also pointed out that when Ibn Ishāq mentioned ^CAmr ibn al-Hārith ibn Zuhayr, he did not say ibn Abī Zuhayr, while ^CAmr was the nephew of ^CIyād ibn Zuhayr.³ Besides the correction of some names he also added the names of others who fought at Badr but seemed to have escaped al-Bakkaī'. They were provided - as he indicated in the version of Ibrāhīm ibn Sa^Cd, Mūsa ibn ^CUqba and al-Bukhārī.⁴

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq mentioned a man called Dhū al-Shamālayn al-Khuza^Cī as being among those who died at Badr. Our author seized the opportunity to correct an error of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī, who related a tradition referring to Dhū al-Shamālayn as Dhū al-Yadayn,⁵ while according to al-Suhaylī the two names stood for two different men. He argued that the tradition that al-Zuhrī reported was on the authority of Abū Hurayra, who became a Muslim, after the Battle of Badr, while Dhū al-

1. Text, vol.5, p.263.

2. Ibid., p.292.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p.300.

5. Al-Zuhrī reported that the Prophet once finished his prayer without completing the four "Rak^Cāt". Then a man called Dhū al-Shamālayn asked him whether he forgot or whether the prayer was made shorter? The Prophet who answered that neither had happened, asked his Companions whether Dhū al-Yadayn was telling the truth. Text, vol.5, p.298.

Shamālayn died at Badr and Dhū al-Yadayn died during the reign of Mu^cāwiyā.¹ He also pointed out that al-Mubarrid who seemed to have been acquainted only with the version of al-Zuhri, maintained the same error, ignoring what the traditionist said about Dhū al-Shamālayn.² However, according to the version of al-Mubarrid there is an interesting addition - the Prophet is reported to have said, I forgot or was caused to forget so as to introduce new laws.³

* * * * *

Similar to the account of Dhū al-Shamālayn was that of al-Sā'ib ibn Abi al-Sā'ib whom Ibn Ishāq mentioned among those who died on the day of Badr with the polytheists. Ibn Hishām disagreed with him saying that he fought at Badr but he became an excellent Muslim afterwards.⁴ Another scholar who seemed to hold the same views of Ibn Ishāq, was al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār. Al-Suhaylī pointed out that Abū ^cUmar al-Namarī in his book al-Istī^cāb criticised the latter for contradicting himself, since al-Zubayr, who said that al-Sā'ib died as a polytheist, also cited two traditions indicating that he died after he became a Muslim.⁵ Al-Suhaylī quoted both traditions. It is worth mentioning that Abū al-Sā'ib was once a partner of the Prophet, and there is a tradition to the effect that the Prophet praised him, saying that he was an excellent partner who was never ill-tempered or obstinate. Al-Suhaylī also drew attention to the difference of opinion upon the tradition itself indicating that it remained unclear whether the Prophet praised

1. Text, vol.5, p.299. See Lubāb, vol.1, pp.445, 446.

2. Text, vol.5, p.298. cf. al-Kāmil, vol.4, p.101; Ṭabaqāt, vol.3, p.167.

3. Al-Kāmil, vol.4, p.101.

4. Text, vol.5, pp.306-7.

5. Ibid., p.350. cf. al-Istī^cāb, vol.2, pp.100-101.

Abū Sā'ib or vice versa. It is noteworthy that in the tradition involved, the Prophet said: (Abū al-Sā'ib) while the man in question was al-Sā'ib. Nevertheless al-Suhaylī, who seemed to agree with Abū ʿUmar al-Namarī, quoted him as saying that the argument is not valid since there were great differences of opinion concerning the man involved in the tradition mentioned.¹

* * * * *

Ibn Ishāq reported on the authority of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr that when the Prophet entered Mecca to perform ʿumra, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Rawāḥa was holding the halter of his camel and reciting poetry (Rajaz). Here are some verses:

We will fight you about its interpretation
As we have fought you about its revelation.²

Ibn Hishām commented that the words, "We will fight you about its interpretation" to the end of the verses, were spoken by ʿAmmār ibn Yāsir about another battle. The proof of that is that Ibn Rawāḥa referred only to the polytheists. They did not believe in the revelation and only those who did would fight for an interpretation of it.³ Al-Suhaylī pointed out that the battle at which ʿAmmār said the verses was Siffīn.⁴ Relying on al-Suhaylī's comment, A. Guillaume described the verses as belonging to Shīʿite polemic.⁵ This account lends support to those who questioned the authenticity of the poetry included in

-
1. Text, vol.5, p.350; al-Istīʿāb, vol.2, p.101.
 2. Text, vol.7, p.8.
 3. Ibid., pp.8-9.
 4. Ibid., p.28.
 5. Life of Muḥammad, p.531.

the Sīra.¹

Pertaining to the same account it is reported in the Sīra that the Prophet prophesied that ^ʿAmmār would be killed by the aggressive party. Al-Suhaylī commented that this prophecy is said to have been fulfilled when ^ʿAmmār was killed at the battle of Siffīn. He added when he was killed, ^ʿAmr ibn al-^ʿĀṣ remembered this prophecy and he was frightened. So he told Mu^ʿāwīya ibn Abi Sufyān. The latter was very bold, he cursed him and said, "It is those who let him come to fight that killed him", alluding to ^ʿAlī's party.²

LINGUISTIC DISCUSSIONS

The word Ṣalāt

With regard to the account of Abū Ṭālib showing kindness to the Prophet, the word ḥadiba was used to signify this meaning.³ Al-Suhaylī commented on that, saying: Originally the derivation of this word is from ḥadab which means a hump or bend in the back. The word is used metaphorically to signify becoming affectionate, favourable, or kind to someone. As the poet said: "All families of Ḍabba became affectionate to me (ḥadibat ^ʿalayya) no matter whether I am the oppressed one or the oppressor".⁴

-
1. The poetry of the Sīra was discussed in a thesis by M.A.Azzam. See A. Guillaume, "The biography of the Prophet in recent research", The Islamic Quarterley, 1 (1954), 6-11.
 2. Text, vol.4, p.265. Ta'rīkh, vol.5, p.41; al-Nubalā', vol.1, p.300.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.44.
 4. Ibid., pp.49-50. cf. Ibn Manẓūr, vol.1, pp.291-93.

Al-Suhaylī extended the information to deal with the word ṣalāt, i.e. prayer. He said: In the same manner is the word ṣalāt. Originally it meant the bend of the ṣalawān. According to him the latter means two veins stretched from the back to the thigh.¹ Hence they say that "He prayed for him", ṣallā^c alayhī, means he bent over him (showing kindness). So when they intend to magnify the meaning of mercy raḥma, they use the word kindness and prayer to represent the meaning. Of the same nature is this commonly used phrase: ṣalla Allāh^c ala Muḥammad. According to our author it is more elegant, eloquent and far-reaching in showing affection and kindness to use the word ṣalla in that respect than to use the word raḥima i.e. have mercy.²

He added: Originally the word ṣalāt is used to signify a tangible action, but it was used here for a rationally realized action to magnify and confirm the meaning. As the poet said: "I am still showing him leniency and kindness, in the same way as a mother shows kindness to her child". After explaining his opinion about the meaning of ṣalāt and its derivation, al-Suhaylī contradicted those of the opinion that ṣalāt means du^c ā', saying that it is a generalisation to say so. Because the word ṣalla can only be made transitive by the addition of the preposition ^cala, you say ṣallaytu^c ala al-mayyit, i.e. I prayed for the dead one; you mean out of pity and kindness to him you implore the mercy of God on him. So ṣallā^c ala is always used to signify kindness, mercy and sympathy. It is impossible to say ṣallaytu^c ala al-^cadū meaning da^c awta^c alayhī (i.e. cursed him), as the word du^c ā' can be made transitive either by the addition of the particles lām or ^calā. It is only when the word du^c ā' is made transitive with the addition of the particle lām that the word

1. Text, vol.3, p.49; Ibn Manẓūr, vol.19, p.199.

2. Text, vol.3, p.49.

ṣalāt can be substituted to give the same meaning. But when one means to curse, one says da^cawtu ^calā. In such a case the word ṣalāt cannot be used.¹

It is worth noting that Ibn al-Qayyim, when quoting al-Suhaylī's opinion concerning the meaning of the word ṣalāt, stated that it was a quotation from al-Suhaylī. Nevertheless the quotation seems not to be from al-Rawḍ. Whereas the meaning is almost the same, though more extensive, the words are absolutely different. Moreover al-Suhaylī's discussion on this point in his book al-Rawḍ is apparently a summary of that quoted by Ibn al-Qayyim.² It seems likely that our author previously discussed most of the points on language and grammar now in al-Rawḍ, probably in his treatises to which he alluded frequently. This is evident in many of Ibn al-Qayyim's quotations. In connection with the word "ṣalāt" for instance, Ibn al-Qayyim, after stating his opinion, quoted al-Suhaylī's, saying: I have seen a good discussion by Abū al-Qāsim Suhaylī of the word ṣalāt and its derivation and here are his words (wa hādha lafẓuhu): Literally the meaning of prayer goes back to kindness and sympathy, except that kindness and sympathy are either felt or rationally realised and to God is assigned what is worthy of His supreme being and is spared what is not worthy of Him. Similarly when supremacy is felt and rationally realised, the part of it which is felt includes the characteristics of entities and what is rationally realised includes the qualities of His supreme being. This meaning exists frequently in the attributes of tangible or intangible entities.³ Another point quoted by Ibn al-Qayyim is the difference between the mercy of worshippers and the mercy of God: Mercy from worshippers is leniency in the heart; when one feels it, one emotionally inclines towards the one

1. Text, vol.3, pp.49-50.

2. Badāi^c al-Fawāid, vol.1, p.26.

3. Ibid.

whom one favours. Whilst mercy from God to worshippers is His bounty. So when He sends blessings to someone it means that He bestows His bounty and grace on him. Mercy is a rationally realised prayer, not tangible. Its fruit from a worshipper is to implore blessings, since he is not capable of doing more than that; whereas its fruit from God is to bestow His bounty and favours on a worshipper. Thus prayer does not vary in its meaning but the fruit of it does. Physical prayer, which consists of bowing and prostration, is actually a tangible bending. Hence the meaning of the word ṣalāt does not vary except by being tangible or rationally realised, which is not in fact a real difference.¹

However Ibn al-Qayyim, who quoted al-Suhaylī's opinion, seems partially to disagree with him as he said that saying that the word ṣalāt means mercy is false for three reasons; the first is that both the words ṣalāt and raḥma occurred in one verse, "They are those on whom (descend) blessings from God, and mercy" (II-157). This certainly indicates that there is a difference between them. The second is that one can implore the mercy of God for any Muslim, while ṣalāt is only for the Prophet and his family. The third reason is that the mercy of God is for all His creatures, while His ṣalāt is only for the best of His worshippers.² However, this is contradictory to the tradition recorded in the Ṣaḥīḥ, to the effect that the Prophet used to say, "Allāhumma ṣalli ʿalayhi" (O God send Your ṣalāt on him) whenever somebody brought alms to him. As narrated by Ibn Abī Awfā: Once when my father brought his alms to the Prophet, zakāt (obligatory charity), he said: "O God send Your ṣalāt on the family of Abī Awfā".³

1. Badaiʿ al-Fawāid, vol.1, p.26.

2. Ibid., pp.27-28.

3. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, The book of invocations, vol.8, p.211.
cf. Ibn Manẓūr, vol.19, p.200.

The word "mu'tima"

Al-Suhaylī explained most of the poetry provided in the Sīra. Renowned scholars like A. Guillaume and others frequently refer to his Commentary for the understanding and translation of the poetry. In one place however, A. Guillaume taking al-Suhaylī as his authority translated the word mu'tima as "pillar". He then said in a footnote: This explanation of mu'tima is based on S.'s statement that elsewhere I.I. says that such is the meaning.¹ Although our author described the explanation which was provided by Ibn Ishāq as obscure, even so, he said: "It is more likely to be the intended meaning as it is provided by the narrator of the tradition".²

However, before explaining the alternative meaning, the verse in which the word occurred should be examined as it is the context that determines the meaning. It was reported that Himās b. Qays ibn Khālīd - the poet who said the verse - was sharpening his sword before the Prophet entered Mecca, and his wife asked him why he was doing so. When he told her it was for Muḥammad and his Companions, she said that she did not think it would do them any harm. He answered that he hoped to give her one of them as a slave and said:

I have no excuse today if they advance
here is my weapon, a long-bladed lance,
A two-edged sword in their faces will dance!³

But when the Muslims under Khālīd arrived, a skirmish followed in which more than twelve men from the polytheists were killed, then they took to flight. Himās (the poet) ran off

1. Life of Muḥammad, p.550.

2. Text, vol.7, p.103.

3. Ibid., p.69. I have adopted the translation of A. Guillaume for the poetry.

and went into his house and told his wife to bolt the door. When she blamed him for not fulfilling his former threat he said:

If you had witnessed the battle of Khandama
when Ṣafwān and ^cIkrima fled
And Abū Yazīd was standing like a (mu'tima)

He then said at the end

You would not have uttered the least word of
blame.¹

Now the scene was that a man was boasting to his wife of his courage and his determination to defeat the enemy, a decision which he could not abide by. So he was trying every possible excuse to justify what he did by showing his wife that he was not the only one to flee, but also the renowned, courageous men took flight too. Thus the word mu'tima is likely to be explained as "a widow left with fatherless children", which was used to indicate that even a man like Abū Yazīd² was left helpless and deplorable, while the translation of the word as pillar gives an indication of firmness or resistance, a meaning which cannot be intended and this is very evident from the last verse. Moreover, according to al-Azraqī it was "kāl^cajūzi'l-mu'tima", i.e. like an old widow left with fatherless children", instead of qā'iman kal-mu'tima, i.e. standing like a widow.³

1. Text, vol.7, p.70; Akhbār Maḥḥa, vol.2, p.269.

2. According to al-Suhaylī, he was Suhayl ibn ^cAmr, the orator (khatīb) or Quraysh. Text, vol.7, p.104. See Ṭabaqāt, vol.5, p.453.

3. Akhbār Maḥḥa, vol.2, p.269. cf. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol.4, p.497.

Metaphorical usages

Regarding the use of certain words figuratively, al-Suhaylī instances first the words "let myself be sacrificed for you". He pointed out: It is not suitable to address God by this word, since a person can sacrifice himself only for those who are subject to annihilation, while God is immortal. However some words can be used figuratively to give meanings other than the original. It was said that this word can be used to express exaltation and devotion. So it is possible to use it in this respect to address God. Al-Suhaylī then extended the information to deal with other words being used figuratively to give meanings which differ from the original, as in taking an oath when exclaiming or making expressions of exaggeration. He instances the saying of the Prophet, "By his father".¹ This refers to a tradition that a man came to the Prophet and asked him about Islam. When the five pillars of Islam were explained to him, he said: "I would neither make any addition to this, nor will I decrease anything out of it". The Prophet remarked, "By his father, he would enter heaven if he were true (to what he professed)".² Al-Suhaylī commented: It is impossible that the Prophet meant to take an oath in the name of anything other than God, let alone by a man who died as an unbeliever, i.e. the father of the man being referred to. He continues: What the Prophet meant was to exclaim about what the man had said. When you make an exclamation, you regard something as great and taking an oath is originally to express the greatness of a thing. Thus it was extended to include this meaning. He then instances a verse of poetry: "If Layla trust me, by the father of her enemies, I will never betray her!" In saying this the poet did not intend taking an oath by the father of her enemies, but rather it was a kind of exclamation. Our author

1. Text, vol.6, p.548.

2. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, the book of faith, vol.1, p.6.

then extended the information to deal with the tradition itself, saying: As regards this tradition, the majority of the commentators considered it as an abrogated one, since it contradicted another in which the Muslims have been forbidden to swear by another name except that of God. The Prophet said: "Verily God has forbidden you to swear by your fathers".¹ According to al-Suhaylī it is not right to claim the abrogation of the first one, because the Prophet was recorded nowhere as taking an oath - before the so-called abrogation - by an entity other than by God, let alone by the non-believers.²

After rejecting the argument that it was an abrogated tradition, al-Suhaylī went on to say: According to another tradition, the narrator³ had misrepresented this tradition by altering it to "by his father", whilst in its original form it was "By God!" He denied this saying that it contradicts the authentic narrators. In order to prove it was not a misrepresentation, he instances two other occasions when the Prophet was reported to have said: "By your father!" Abū Hurayra reported that a man came to the Prophet and said: "Which alms are most excellent?" The Prophet said: "By your father, behold! You should give alms when you are healthy..."⁴ The second tradition is narrated thus: A man came to the Prophet and asked: "Who amongst the people is most deserving of my good treatment?" The Prophet said: "By your father, you will get the answer..."⁵ Al-Suhaylī reproached

1. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, the book of faith, vol.1, p.6.

2. Text, vol.6, p.548.

3. Al-Suhaylī referred to the narrator as Ismā'īl ibn Ja^cfar whilst according to Muslim the narrator was Ṭaḥa ibn ^cUbayd Allāh. cf. Muslim, op. cit.; Text, vol.6, p.548.

4. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.2, p.494.

5. Ibid., vol.4, p.1354.

those who neglected these two traditions and accused the narrator of misrepresenting the first one. He concluded that those who say it is an abrogated tradition imply that taking an oath by the name of one's father was permissible before that, which is impossible. But what was intended on these occasions was an exclamation. Furthermore the Prophet was nowhere recorded as taking an oath by the name of his own father, which is a proof for what was said.¹

However, others are of the same opinion that the Prophet did not use this phrase, "by his father", in the sense of an oath, but used it only to stress the importance of his assertion. It was a catchword of the Arabs and they frequently used it in their speech and conversation.² For this reason it could be suggested that this word rolled off the Prophet's tongue spontaneously, as the exclamation is not clear in the last two examples.

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

It is reported in the Sīra that when the Prophet began openly to preach Islam and call people to it, some men went to Abū Tālib, the Prophet's uncle, and asked him to put an end to it all. The latter was deeply distressed at the rift between his people and their enmity and he explained that to the Prophet who answered: "O my uncle, by God, if they were to put the sun in my right hand and the moon in my left on condition that I abandon this course, before God has made it victorious, or I perish therein, still I would not abandon it".³

Al-Suhaylī speculated that the Prophet mentioned particularly the sun in his right hand and the moon in his left because they are the sign of the day (positive sign) and

-
1. Text, vol.6, p.359.
 2. Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, vol.1, p.6.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.46.

the sign of the night (negative sign) respectively.¹ He then quoted a tradition to the effect that a man said to ^CUmar ibn al-Khattāb: "I have seen in a dream as if the sun and the moon were fighting; with each of them there were stars". Thereupon ^CUmar asked him: "On which side were you?" "With the moon", replied the man. ^CUmar said: "You were with the 'negative' sign. Go, do not do any work for me", and sacked him. Al-Suhaylī added that this man was killed at Siffīn on the side of Mu^Cāwiya and his name was Hābis ibn Sa^Cd.²

Our author went on to say: The Prophet particularized the two luminous bodies al-nayyirān when mentioning this story, because their light is perceptible to the senses (maḥsūs) whilst the light which he brought forth from God is by far more sublime. God said: "Fain would they extinguish God's Light with their mouths, but God will not allow but that His Light should be perfected" (IX-32). Thus the Prophet's eloquence demanded the mentioning of these two luminous bodies by way of contrast, at a time when they wanted him to abandon the highest light.³

However, as has been mentioned, al-Suhaylī sometimes builds theories on a tradition which is probably not authentic. Nevertheless his remark about the man who was killed fighting with Mu^Cāwiya highlights his opinion on that particular event.

Proverbial sayings of the Prophet

Al-Suhaylī said that al-Jāḥiẓ had been taken to task for saying: We have never received more sublime sayings than the Prophet's (al-nabī), even though al-Jāḥiẓ quoted the afore-

-
1. Text, vol.3, p.53. The allusion is to verse 12 of sūrat al-Isrā'.
 2. Text, vol.3, p.53. cf. Ibn Sirīn, p.262.
 3. Text, vol.3, p.52.

mentioned statement from Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb. According to al-Suhaylī he misspelled the name al-Battī¹ for al-nabī, as both words can be easily confused in Arabic script. The argument of those who reproached al-Jāhiz was that the Prophet is superior to all men and neither he nor his sayings should be compared with anyone or anything, even with the most eloquent.²

However, al-Suhaylī did not express his own opinion, though he proceeded to contradict what he reported by producing some of the Prophet's unprecedented sayings. For instance, during the battle of Awtās the Prophet was reported to have said, "al-ān ḥamiya al-waṭīs".³ This, in literal terms, means "the oven became vehemently hot". The Prophet used it to describe the vehement state of the fight.⁴ Now this saying is used as a proverb, relating to a severe case or event. Another example adduced by al-Suhaylī is "māta ḥatfa anfiḥī"⁵ which means, "He died in his bed; a natural death, respiring until he yielded his last breath". According to some lexicologists the nose is particularized as meaning that the spirit passes from the nose, or because the spirit was believed to pass from the mouth and the nose, and the latter of these is made predominant.⁶ As al-Suhaylī stated, this saying was first used by the Prophet as a reference to the merit of those who die on the battlefield, not in such a

-
1. ^c Uthmān ibn Sulaymān al-Battī, a trustworthy traditionist and a faqīh. He was a mawla of Banū Zuhra; Ṭabaqāt, vol.7, p.257.
 2. Text, vol.7, pp.199, 200. cf. al-Bayān, vol.2, p.15.
 3. Ibid. cf. Murūj, vol.2, pp.292-297; Zakkār, p.93; Maghāzī, vol.3, p.898.
 4. Text, vol.7, p.199.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Lane. cf. Ibn Manẓūr, vol.10, p.382.

way.¹ Now it is used to describe the death of a human being and also of any animal when it dies naturally.

He also brought forward another saying of the Prophet. It was reported that on the day of Uhud, the Prophet said to Abū ʿAzza al-Jumahī, "Lā yuldaghu al-mu'min min juhrin marratayn", which means "The believer should not be bitten twice by the same snake or scorpion". That was because the Prophet had taken Abū ʿAzza as a prisoner at Badr and released him on condition that he should not fight against him again; so the saying is used as a proverb, relating to a state when someone has had a bad experience and has found himself in the same circumstances again, as when Abū ʿAzza asked the Prophet on the day of Uhud to forgive him again.² It was also reported that the Prophet said to him, "You shall not stroke your cheeks in Mecca after this and say, 'I have deceived Muḥammad twice'".³

Another saying of the Prophet recorded by al-Suhaylī is: lann yantaṭiḥ fihā ʿanzān, which literally means "two goats will not smite each other with their horns for her sake",⁴ the occasion being the killing of ʿAṣmā', daughter of Marwān of Banū Umayya ibn Zayd,⁵ who displayed hostility after the killing of Abū ʿAfak.⁶ The Prophet then asked his Companions to rid him of her, so ʿUmayr ibn ʿAdī al-Khaṭmī went to her house and killed her. He then came to the Prophet and told him what he had done and he said: "You have helped God and His Apostle, O ʿUmayr". When the latter asked if he

1. Text, vol.7, p.199.

2. Ibid. cf. al-Aghānī, vol.15, p.180.

3. Text, vol.7, p.199.

4. Ibid. cf. pp.532-533.

5. Ibid., p.499.

6. Was described as a hypocrite of Banū ʿAmr ibn ʿAwf. Killed by Sālim b. ʿUmayr. Ibid.

would have to suffer any evil consequences the Prophet said the afore-mentioned saying, alluding to a case in which there would not be any discord or contention.¹ Al-Suhaylī added that the woman involved was Jewish and she used to dispose of the menstrual cloth in the Mosque of Banū Ḥaṭma.²

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

It is obvious in this chapter that al-Suhaylī has preserved some valuable historical accounts which are relatively unknown or quoted from inaccessible sources. He has also endeavoured to reconcile seemingly contradictory accounts in which he tried to reveal the obscurity involved. By doing this al-Suhaylī highlights some aspects of the Prophet's personality. He also demonstrates the considerable care he took to present the readers of the sīra with as much evidence for the versions he adopts as was available to him. Thus, he presents the modern scholar with an insight into the study of sīra at his time.

1. Text, vol.7, pp.500, 532.

2. Ibid., p.533. See al-Maydānī, vol.2, p.448; Murūj, vol.2, pp.292-297; al-Imtāʿ^C, vol.2, p.92; al-Mawardī, pp.213-4.

CONCLUSION

Abd al-Rahmān ibn Abd Allāh al-Suhaylī lived from 508 to 581 A.H. He spent most of his long life in al-Andalus. However, three years before his death he moved and settled in Marrakish at the court of Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf ibn Abd al-Mu'min, the then reigning caliph of the Almohads. This dynasty was founded by Ibn Tumart (d. 524), an eminent disciple of al-Ghazālī (d. 505). The doctrine preached by Ibn Tumart points to a blend of influence from both the Zāhirite school of thought, developed by Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456), as well as al-Ghazālī's modified Ash'arite theology. As for al-Suhaylī, he was a disciple of Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī (d. 543), who, like Ibn Tumart, had been one of al-Ghazālī's friends and disciples. Furthermore, it was Ibn al-'Arabī who introduced the books of al-Ghazālī into al-Andalus. Described as an Ash'arite theologian with a particular interest in al-Ghazālī's methodology, he was vigorously opposed to the Zāhirite views prevalent at the time. He would ridicule them in front of his students, warning them not to fall into that way of thinking, whilst constantly impressing upon them the importance of studying Ash'arite theology.

However, during the first years of al-Suhaylī's life the study of theology and philosophy in general remained severely restricted due to the predominance of the doctrines of the Mālikī school in al-Andalus. For although their capital, Marrakish, fell to the Almohads in the year 539, the Almoravid Dynasty continued to hold sway over the Muslim provinces of al-Andalus until 542, when they too were finally taken. That year spelt an end to the exclusive patronage practised by the Almoravids, who demonstrated their preference for Mālikī doctrines by bestowing favours solely on those jurists whose energies were devoted to the study of such. As a result throughout this period even the Qur'ān and ḥadīth could only be approached through this doctrine. That briefly was the situation such as it existed throughout al-Suhaylī's early years in al-Andalus. What attempts were made by al-Suhaylī towards reform in

this area are laid out clearly in Chapter IV of this thesis. Instead of referring to the Qur'ān and hadīth through the works of jurists, our author went straight to the Prophet's practice as recorded in the Sīra, taking that as the main source for legislation. By so doing he turned on its head the practice hitherto accepted by the Almoravid court, for according to him the jurists were rather to be examined in the light of the Prophet's practice and not vice versa. The reason for this total change in approach, he argued, was that the Prophet's life was the example par excellence of the correct application of both the Qur'ān and hadīth. Thus al-Suhaylī was for the first time to put the Sīra in its proper perspective, making him the true pioneer in the field of fiqh al-sīra.

Having once decided that al-Suhaylī was the pioneer of this field, what then was the position of Ibn al-Qayyim, who has until recently been widely recognised as such at the expense of al-Suhaylī? It is clear that he was well acquainted with al-Suhaylī's views from the way in which he so freely refers to them in his own book, Badā'i' al-Fawā'id, amongst others. That he fails to mention him in his Zād al-Ma'ād, the work which earned him the title of pioneer in fiqh al-sira, strongly suggests that he was aware of merely doing no more than following in the footsteps of al-Suhaylī.

After the final annexation of al-Andalus by the Almohads in 542 A.H., a dynasty basing its philosophy and theology on the views of the Ash'arite school, well known for its links with both the Mālikite and Shāfi'ite forms of jurisprudence, al-Suhaylī too (as demonstrated in Chapter IV) showed no aversion to quoting the views of either Mālik or al-Shāfi'ī or both. Indeed, whilst commonly misrepresented as a Mālikite jurist, he made no secret of his devotion to the Ash'arite school of thought. This he emphasised by his use of the pronoun 'we' whenever quoting Ash'arite arguments against those of the Mu'tazilites in discussing theology. From this one can surmise that had al-Suhaylī been of Mālikite persuasion he would most probably have done likewise in juristic arguments, not hovering between the views of Mālik and al-Shāfi'ī like the thorough-going

Ash^Carite he was.

From the exposition of his views on Qur'ān exegesis it is clear that, unlike his teacher, Ibn al-^CArabī, al-Suhaylī was influenced by both Ash^Carite and Zāhirite doctrines. The influence of the latter is illustrated notably by his ready acceptance of all versions of the traditions regarding the account of the ascent to heaven, to the extent that he adopted a belief in the twofold nature of the Prophet's experience of the mi^Crāj. In other words he endeavoured to prove that the mi^Crāj took place twice: once in a vision, and once as a physical journey. A further example of his acceptance of Zāhirite methodology is found in his explanation of many suras. This enabled him to follow a lexicographical method to reveal the obscurities involved in the explanation of certain verses; and these he introduced into his own exegesis.

However, one of the strongest pieces of evidence for his having been influenced by the Ash^Cariyya was his acceptance of the tradition where the Prophet is said to have been bewitched: the Ash^Cariyya were peculiar in admitting that Prophets are subject to bodily affliction, their infallibility being confined - in their view - to the affliction of their minds and their beliefs. Yet another example of the impact of the Ash^Cariyya on al-Suhaylī was his views on naskh or abrogation in Qur'ān. He maintained the views of the Ash^Cariyya who held it quite feasible that a ruling be revealed in the Qur'ān and remain valid even though the wording of it has subsequently been annulled, while the Mu^Ctazilites denied this. However, our author, whilst broadly subscribing to the Ash^Carite view on naskh, introduced his own neat system whereby he made use of the khavar argument to justify the argument in favour of the rule. For al-Suhaylī not only can the reading of some verses of the Qur'ān be annulled, but some other verses can have a reading different from that given in the Mushaf; nor was he in the least hesitant to adopt such a reading if it could serve to validate his opinion concerning the explanation of such verses.

Turning from the quest of al-Suhaylī's thinking to the lasting value of his work: through his citations from the version of Yūnus and other sources which are no longer extant, al-Suhaylī has preserved much valuable material regarding events more or less ignored by other more historically oriented sources. Chapter VII of this thesis shows to what extent al-Suhaylī has presented his reader with ready answers to so many of the questions raised by some accounts in the sīra as he himself strove to reconcile seemingly contradictory accounts by pointing to, and endeavouring to penetrate the obscurity surrounding them. By so doing al-Suhaylī has shed light on many aspects of the Prophet's personality, demonstrating the painstaking care he took to present the reader of the sīra with no less evidence for the versions he adopts than was available to him. Thus he has left the modern scholar with an insight into the study of sīra at his time.

Pertaining to al-Suhaylī's use of Yūnus' version *

لما كان السهيلي قد اعتمد في دراسته للسيرة على نسخة يونس بن بكير بجانب نسخة ابن هشام، ولما كان في نسخة السيرة برواية يونس الحالية كثير من النقص فقد رأيت من تمام الفائدة أن أنقل هنا بعض الأجزاء التي أوردها السهيلي عن يونس والتي سقطت من الجزء الموجود . وأود أن أوضح كذلك أن السهيلي يورد العادة أحيانا ثم يصفها بأنها عن ابن اسحاق من غير رواية البكائي، ولكن في كثير من الأحيان تكون هذه العادة من رواية يونس وهاك بعض الأمثلة :

ذكر قصة أم شريك الدوسية وقال (ذكرها ابن اسحاق في السيرة من غير رواية ابن هشام) وهو أطول مما ذكرنا¹.

وقال كذلك : " وفي غير رواية البكائي عن ابن اسحاق أن فاطمة بنت النعمان التجارية كان لها تابع من الجن ، وكان اذا جاءها اقتحم عليها² . ثم أكل القصة ، وهي بتامها في رواية يونس² .

وقال : " وفي رواية أخرى الزنيم الذي له زنمتان من الشر يعرف بهما³ .

وكذلك ذكر رجوع المسلمين من الحبشة فقال : " وكان سببه أن الرسول صلعم حين قرأ سورة النجم ثم قال : " ذكره ابن اسحاق من غير رواية البكائي⁴ .

كما أورد شعرا نُسبه الى عبد العطلب وذكر أنه عوّذ به النبي ودعا له وهو صغير ، ووصف الشعر بأنه في غير رواية ابن هشام .

1- Text, vol. 6, p.578 cf Yūnus, p.264/pas. 443.

2- Text, vol. 2, p.313 cf Yūnus, p. 92/pas. 122.

3- Text, vol. 3, p.320 cf Yūnus, p.217/pas. 321.

4- Text, vol. 3, p.344 cf Yūnus, p.157/pas. 219.

والشعر موجود في النسخة الحالية من رواية يونس ، وقد وقع خطأ في البيت الثاني حيث قيد

أعيذه بالله ذى الأركان¹

والصحيح كما نقله السهيلي ، وهو

أعيذه بالبيت ذى الأركان²

وفي القصيدتين بعض الاختلافات الأخرى الطفيفة .

1- The poetry of Ibn al-Zibāra praising Banū 'Abd Manāf.

قال ابن اسحاق : " انما كان اسم هاشم (بن عبد مناف) عرا ، فما سمي هاشما إلا بهشمة الخبز بمكة لقومه ، فقال شاعر من قريش أو من بعض العرب :

عرو الذي هشم الثريد لقومه ، قوم بمكة مستنين عجاف³
ونسب السهيلي القصيدة لعبد الله بن الزبيري وقال : " وكان سبب مدح ابن الزبيري بهذه الأبيات ، وهو سمي ، لبني عبد مناف - فيما ذكره ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس - أنه كان قد هجا قصياً بشعر كتبه في أستار الكعبة ، أوله :

ألهى قصياً عن المجد الأساطير ومشية مثل ما تعشي الشقارير
فاستعدوا عليه بني سهم ، فأسلموه اليهم ، فضربوه وحلقوا شعره ، وربطوه ،
الى صخرة بالحجون ، فاستغاث قومه فلم يغيثوه ، فجعل يعدح قصياً ويسترضيهم ،
فأطلقه بنو عبد مناف منهم وأكرموه ، فمدحهم بهذا الشعر⁴ .

1- Yūnus, p. 22/pas. 28.

2- Text, vol. 2, p. 157.

3- Ibid, p. 65.

4- Ibid, p. 87.

كانت قریش بيضة، فتفقات ، فالمحّ خالصه لعبد مناف
والخالطين فقيرهم بخنيهم، والظاعنين لرحلة الأضياف
والرائشين، وليس يوجد رائش، والقائلين "هلمّ" للأضياف
عمرو الملا هشم الشريد لقومه، قوم بمكة مستئين عجاف
وبأشعار كثيرة ذكرها ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس¹.

2- The name of the woman who offered herself in marriage to the Prophet's father.

ب - قال السهيلي: المرأة التي دعت عبد الله بن عبد المطلب الى نفسها هي رقية بنت نوفل أخت ورقة بن نوفل، تكى أم قتال، وبهذه الكنية وقع ذكرها في رواية يونس عن ابن اسحاق² "إلا أن كنيته قد وردت في رواية يونس (أم قتال)،³ ويبدو أنه خطأ من الناسخ. وكذلك ورد في "دلائل النبوة" للبيهقي (أم قتال)⁴ "إلا أنه سها، فقال: "اسمها"، وهو كنيته والجد يربالذكر أن البيهقي قد نقل الخبر عن يونس عن ابن اسحاق أيضا.

3- Pertaining to the account of Tubba'.⁵

ج - وفي خبر تبع زاد السهيلي: وفي رواية يونس عن ابن اسحاق قال: واسم الحبر الذي كلم الملك: بليامين، وذكر أن امرأة اسمها: فكيهة من بني زريق كانت تحمل له الماء من بئر رومه بعدما قال له الحبران ما قالا، وكف عن قتال أهل المدينة، ودخلوا عسكره، فأعطى فكيهة حتى أغناها، فلم تزل هي وعشيرتها من أغنى الأنصار حتى جاء الإسلام. ولما آمن الملك بمحمد - صلى الله عليه وسلم - وأطم بخبره قال:

1- Text, vol. 2, p. 84.

2- Ibid, p. 142.

3- Yūnus, p. 20/pas. 25.

4- Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa, vol. 1, p. 41.

5- C. Life of Muhammad, p. 7.

شهدت على أحد أنه	نبي من الله باري التسم
فلو عدت عرى الى عره	لكنت وزيرا له ، وابن عم
وجاهدت بالسيف أعداءه ،	وفرجت عن صدره كل هم ¹

4- Related to the account of 'Umar when he accepted Islam.

وفي إسلام عمر قال السهيلي: " وفي رواية يونس أن عمر حين قرأ في الصحيفة سورة طه انتهى منها الى قوله: " لتجزى كل نفس بما تسعى " : ١٥ ، فقال : ما أطيب هذا الكلام وأحسنه ، وذكر هذا الحديث بطوله² .
وفي الرواية الحالية لا يوجد قول عمر: " ما أطيب هذا الكلام وأحسنه³ .
وهذا يدل على انه ربما كان في بعض الفقرات الموجودة من نسخة يونس شيء من النقص .

5-The night journey.

وفي خبر الإسراء قال السهيلي: " وفي رواية يونس: " انه وه قريشا بقدوم المعير التي أرشدهم الى البعير، وشرب إناءهم، وأنهم سيقدمون ويخبرون بذلك، فقالوا: " يا محمد متى يقدمون؟ " فقال: " يوم الأربعاء " . فلما كان ذلك اليوم، ولم يقدموا حتى كربت الشمس أن تغرب، فدعا الله فحبس الشمس حتى قدموا كما وصف، قال: " ولم تحبس الشمس إلا له ذلك اليوم، وليوشع بن نون⁴ .

6- The vision of God.

وفي خبر رؤية النبي ربه قال السهيلي: " روى يونس عن ابن اسحاق عن داود بن ابن الحصين قال: سأل مروان أبا هريرة: هل رأى محمد ربه؟ قال: " نعم " . وفي رواية يونس أن ابن عمر أرسل الى ابن عباس يسأله: " هل رأى محمد ربه؟ " فقال:

1- Text, vol. 1, p. 163.

2- Ibid, vol. 1, p. 277.

3- Yūnus, p. 162/pas. 223.

4- Text, op.cit, pp. 416, 417

" نعم رآه " فقال ابن عمر : " وكيف رآه ؟ فقال ابن عباس كلاما كرهت أن أوردته بلفظه لما يوهم من التشبيه ، ولو صح لكان له تأويل ، والله أعلم " .¹

7- Women gave pledge to the Prophet.

وفي بيعة النساء قال السهيلي : وذكر ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس فيما أخذه عليه السلام طيهن : أن قال : ولا تغششن أزواجكن ، قالت إحداهن : وما نغشش أزواجنا ؟ فقال : أن تأخذى من ماله فتحابي به غيره .²

8- Some words written in different ways.

وقال بقيق الخضمان بالياء كذا وجدته في رواية يونس عن ابن اسحاق³ وقال : والصحيح ما نغذ صوت وكذا وجدته في رواية يونس بن بكير عن ابن اسحاق كما كان في الأصل .⁴

9- An ode concerning the Hijra ascribed to Abū Bakr.

وقال : وفي السير من رواية يونس شعر لأبي بكر رضي الله عنه في قصة الغار :
 قال النبي ، ولم يزل يوقظني ؟ ونحن في سدف من ظلمة الغار :
 لا تخش شيئا ، فإن الله ثالثا ، وقد توكل لي منه بإظهار
 وإنما كيد من تخشى بوادره كيد الشياطين كادته لكفار ،
 والله مهلكهم طرا بما كسبوا وجاعل المنتهى منهم الى النار
 وأنت مرتحل عنهم وتاركهم ، إنا غدوا وإنا مدلج سارى
 وهاجر أرضهم حتى يكون لنا قوم عليهم ذوو عز وأنصار
 حتى إذا الليل وارتنا جوانبه وسد من دون من تخشى بأستار
 سار الأريقط يهدينا ، وأينقه ينعبن بالقرم نعبا تحت أكوار
 يعصفن عرض الدنيا بعد أطولها وكل سبب رفاق الترب موار

1- Ibid, p. 446.

2- Ibid, vol. 4, p. 96.

3- Ibid, p. 99.

4- Ibid, p. 125.

حتى اذا قلت : قد انجدن عارضها
يردى به مشرف الأقطار معترم
فقال : كروا ، فقلت : إن كرتنا
أن يخسف الأرض بالأحوى وفارسه
فهيل لنا رأى أرساغ مقربه
فقال : هل لكم أن تطلقوا فرسي
وأصرف الحي عنكم إن لقيتهم
فادعوا الذى هو عنكم كف عورتنا
فقال قولا رسول الله مبتهلا :
فنبه سالما من شر دعوتنا
فأظهر الله ، إذ يدعو ، حوافره ،
من دلج فارس في منصب وار
كالسيد ذى اللبدة المستأسد الضارى
من دونها لك نصر الخالق البارى
فانظر الى أربع في الأرض عوار
قد سخن في الأرض لم يحفر بمحفار
وتأخذوا موثقي في نصح أسرار
وأن أمور منهم عين عوار
يطلق جوادى وأنتم خير أبرار
يارب إن كان منه غير إخبار
ومهر مطلقا من كلم آثار
وفاز فارسه من هول أخطار 1

10- Pertaining to the account of Umm Ma'bad.

قال السهيلي : وزاد يونس في روايته أن قريشا لما سمعت الهاتف من الجن أرسلوا
الى أم معبد ، وهي بخيمتها ، فقالوا : هل مر بك محمد الذى من حليته كذا ،
فقال : لا أدري ما تقولون ، وإنما ضافني حالب الشاة الحائل 2

11- The name of a camel.

وقال : وذكر أن أوسا حمل رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - على جمل له ،
يقال له : ابن الرداء ، وفي رواية يونس بن بكير عن ابن اسحاق يقال له الرداح 3

12- The building of the Mosque in Madīna.

قال السهيلي : وذكر ابن اسحاق في هذا الموضع الحديث الوارد عن عمار ، وهو :
أول من بنى لله مسجدا عمار بن ياسر ، فيقال : كيف أضاف الى عمار بنيان المسجد ،

1-Ibid, pp. 218-220.

2-Ibid, p. 225.

3-Ibid, p. 251.

وقد بناء معه الناس؟ فيقول إنما عنى بهذا الحديث مسجد قباء، لأن عمارا هو الذى أشار على النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ببنائه، وهو جمع الحجارة له . فلما آتاه رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - استتم بنيانه عمار . كذلك ذكر ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس بن بكير عنه.¹

13- The story of Banū Ubayriq.

قال السهيلي: " وكان من قصة الدرعين، وقصة بشير، أن بني أبيريق، وهم ثلاثة بشير ومبشر وبشر، نهبوا مشربة أو نهبوا بشير وحده على ما قال ابن اسحاق، وكانت المشربة لرفاعة بن زيد، وسرقوا أدراعه وطعاما، فعثر على ذلك، فجاء ابن أخيه قتادة بن النعمان يشكو بهم إلى رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - فجاء أسيد بن عروة بن أبيريق إلى رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - فقال: يا رسول الله، إن هؤلاء عدوا إلى أهل بيت هم أهل صلاح ودين، فأبندوهم بالسرقه، وموههم بها من غير بينة، وجعل يجادل عنهم حتى غضب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - على قتادة ورفاعة، فأنزل الله تعالى: "ولا تجادل عن الذين يختلون أنفسهم" للنساء ١٠٢ (الآية)، وأنزل الله عز وجل: "ومن يكسب خطيئة أو إثما ثم يرم به بريئا" (النساء ١١٢) . وكان البريء الذى رموه بالسرقه لبيد بن سهل . قالوا: ما سرقناه وإنما سرقه لبيد بن سهل، فبرأه الله . فلما أنزل الله فيهم ما أنزل، هرب ابن أبيريق السارق إلى مكة، ونزل على سلافة بنت سعد بن شهيد، فقال فيها حسان بن ثابت بيتا، يعرض فيه بها، فقالت: إنما أهديت لي شعر حسان، وأخذت رحله، فطرحته خارج المنزل، وقالت: حلقت وعلقت وخرقت إن بت في منزلي ليلة سوداء، فهرب إلى خيبر، ثم أنه نقب بيتا ذات ليلة فسقط الحائط عليه فمات . وقال ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس بن بكير عنه: بشير أبو طعمة . فليس طعمة إذا أسما له، وإنما هو أبو طعمة، كما ذكر ابن اسحاق في هذه الرواية، والله أعلم . وفي رواية يونس أيضا أن الحائط الذى سقط عليه كان بالطائف لا بخيبر،

1- Ibid, p. 266.

كما قال ابن سلام ، وأن أهل الطائف قالوا حينئذ : ما فارق محمداً من أصحابه من فيه خير . والأبيات التي روى بها حسّان المرأة ، وهي من بني عمرو بن عوف ، وقد تقدّم اسمها :

وما سارق الدرعين إذ كنت ذا كرا بنى كرم من الرجال أودعه
وقد أنزلته بنت سعد ، فأصبحت يئازعها جار استها وتنازه
ظننتم بأن يخفى الذئ قد صنعتم وفيكم نبيّ عنده الوحي واضعه
وذكر الشعر والخبر بطوله ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس عنه¹ .

14- Sa'd ibn 'Ubadā and the Prophet.

وقال : وذكر في حديث عبد الله (بن أبي) أن رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - دخل على سعد بن عبادة يعود ، وفي رواية يونس زيادة ، فيها فقه ، قال : كان سعد قد دطه رجل من الليل فخرج إليه فضربه الرجل بسيف فأشواه ، فجاءه النبي - صلعم - يعوده من تلك الضربة ، ولامه على خروجه ليلاً ، وهذا هو موضع الفقه² .

15- Badr is a name of a man.

وقال : وروى يونس عن ابن أبي زكريا عن الشعبي قال : بدر : اسم رجل كانت له بدر³ .

16- The sword of Abū Jahl.

وقال : وروى يونس عن أبي العميس ، قال : أراني القاسم بن عبد الرحمن سيف عبد الله بن مسعود ، قال : هذا سيف أبي جهل حين قتله ، فأخذته ، فإذا سيف قصير عريض فيه قبائع فضة وحلق فضة . قال أبو عيس : فضرب به القاسم عنق

1- *Ibid*, pp. 411-413.

2- *Ibid*, vol. 5, p. 43.

3- *Ibid*, p. 116.

ثور فقطعه ، وثلث فيه ثلثا ، فرأيت القاسم جزع من ثلثه جزعا شديدا¹.

17- Umm Habīb daughter of al-Abbās.

وقال السهيلي عن أم حبيب بنت العباس : " وقد ذكرها ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس ، وذكر أن رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - رآها وهي طفلة تدب بين يديه ، فقال : إن بلغت هذه وأنا حي تزوجتها ، فقبض عليه السلام قبل أن تبلغ فتزوجها سفيان بن الأسود بن عبد الأسد² . وهذا مخالف لرواية يونس حيث قال : فتزوجها الأسود بن عبد الأسد أخو أبي سلفة³.

18- The burial of Abū Lahab.

وبشأن دفن أبي لهب قال السهيلي : وقال ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس لم يحفروا له ، ولكن أسند إلى حائط وقذفت عليه الحجارة من خلف الحائط ووري ، وذكر أن عائشة كانت إذا مرت بموضعه ذلك غطت وجهها⁴.

19- Pertaining to the account of Ka'b ibn al-Ashraf.

وفي خبر كعب بن الأشرف قال السهيلي : وكان قد شتّب بنساء المسلمين ، وآداهم وكان قد شتّب بآم الفضل زوج العباسيين عبد المطلب فقال : أراحل أنت ؟ لم ترحل لمنقبة ، وتارك أنت أم الفضل بالحرم ؟ في أبيات رواها يونس عن ابن اسحاق⁵.

20- The meaning of Bughāth.

وقال : وقال ابن اسحاق في رواية يونس عند ذكر البغاث : البغاث هو ذكر الرخم إذا هرم اسود⁶.

1- Ibid, pp. 143-144.

2- Ibid, p. 189.

3- Yūnus, p. 249/pas. 400 cf p.87 above.

4- Text, vol. 5, p. 190.

5- Ibid, p.413 cf Yūnus, p.297/pas 501. Poetry is missing.

6- Text, op. cit, p. 459.

21- Wahshī accepts Islam.

وقال : وفي رواية يونس عن ابن اسحاق زيادة في إسلام وحشي، قال : لما قدم المدينة، قال الناس : يا رسول الله هذا وحشي، فقال : دعوه، فلإسلام رجل واحد أحب إليّ من قتل ألف رجل كافر¹.

22- The name ' Māwiyya'.

وفي خبر مقتل خبيب قال السهيلي : وقوله ماوية بنت حجير بالواو، رواه يونس ابن بكير عن ابن اسحاق، ورواه غيره عن ابن اسحاق : مارية بالراء، وبالواو وقع في النسخ العتيقة من رواية ابن هشام، كما رواه ابن بكير² . وقد وقع الاسم في السيرة بالواو إلا أن ابن هشام قال : ماوية مولاة حجير³، وقال السهيلي : بنت حجير، ويبدو أنه سهو من السهيلي .

23- The account of 'Amir ibn Fuhayra.

وعن مصير بن فهيرة قال السهيلي : وذكر ابن اسحاق عن هشام بن عروة عن أبيه أن عامر بن الطفيل قال يومئذ : من رجل لما طعنته رفع حتى رأيت السماء من دونه ؟ هذه رواية البكائي عن ابن اسحاق، وروى يونس بن بكير عنه بهذا الإسناد أن عامر بن الطفيل قدم المدينة بعد ذلك، وقال للنبي عليه السلام : من رجل يا محمد لما طعنته رفع إلى السماء ؟ فقال : هو عامر بن فهيرة⁴ .

24- The pertaining to the burial of Sa'd ibn Ma'adh.

وفي خبر سعد بن معاذ قال السهيلي : وذكر ابن اسحاق في رواية (الشيبة) يعني يونس عنه، قال : حدثني أمية بن عبد الله، قال : قلت لبعض أهل سعد ابن معاذ : ما بلغكم في هذا، يعني الضعة التي ألقيها القبر عليه ؟ قال : كان

1- *Ibid*, p. 461 *cf.* p.80 above.

2- *Ibid*, vol. 6, p. 187.

3- *Ibid*, p. 166.

4- *Ibid*, p. 205.

يقصر في بعض الطهور من البول بعض التقصير¹

25- The Prophet prays for 'Alī.

وفي دعا الرسول - صلى الله عليه وسلم - لعلي رضي الله عنه قال السهيلي وزاد الشيباني (يعني يونس) عن ابن اسحاق في هذا الحديث حين ذكر أن علياً كان أرمداً ، وأن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - تغل في عينيه فبرأ ؛ قال : فما رجعت عينه حتى مضى لسبيله ؛ قال : وكان علي يلبس القباء المعشور الثخين في شدة الحر ، فلا يبالى بالحر ، ويلبس الثوب الخفيف في شدة البرد ، فلا يبالى بالبرد ؛ وسئل عن ذلك ، فأخبر أن النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - دعا له يوم خيبر حيث ردت عينه أن يشفيه الله ، وأن يجنبه الحر والبرد ، فكان ذلك².

26- The Prophet apologizes to Safiyya.

قال السهيلي : وروى يونس عن ابراهيم بن اسماعيل بن مجمع الأنصاري ، قال : حدثني عثمان بن كعب القرظي ، قال : حدثني رجل من بني النضير ، كان في حجر صفية بنت حيي من رهطها يقال له : ربيع ، عن صفية بنت حيي قالت : ما رأيت قط أحسن خلقاً من رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ، لقد رأيته ركب بي من خيبر حين أفاء الله عليه على ناقته ليلاً ، فجعلت أنعم فيضرب رأسي مؤخرة الرجل ، فيمسنني بيده ، ويقول : يا هذه مهلا يا ابنة حيي ، حتى إذا جاء الصبأ ، قال : أما إني احذر اليك يا صفية مما صنعت بقومك ، انهم قالوا لي : كذا ، وقالوا لي : كذا³.

27- Pertaining to the rules involved in using water as a purifier.

وقال في شأن أحكام الماء : ووقع في رواية يونس في السيرة أن النبي صلى الله

1- Ibid, p. 323.

2- Ibid, p. 560.

3- Ibid, p. 562.

عليه وسلم - اخسل عام الفتح من جفنة فيها ماء وكافور¹.

28- A piece of information al-Suhaylī said it proved that wheat was used as food.

وفي خبر كتاب حاطب بن أبي بلتعة الى قريش قال السهيلي : وفي هذا الخبر من رواية الشيباني أن عائشة قالت : دخل علي أبو بكر وأنا أغربل حنطة لنا ، فسألني ، وذكر باقي الحديث².

29- The Prophet forbade killing a Qurashite tied hands and feet.

وفي ذكر قتل ابن خطل قال السهيلي : وعندما قتل النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ابن خطل قال : لا يقتل قريشي صبرا بعد هذا ، كذلك قال يونس في روايته³.

30- The Prophet's Khutba on the conquest of Mecca.

وقال : وخطبته عليه السلام أطول مما ذكره ابن هشام ، وفيها من رواية الشيباني (يونس) عن ابن اسحاق نهيه عن صيام يومين ، وصلاة ساعتين : يعني طلوع الشمس وغروبها ، وأن لا يتوارث أهل ملتين ، وعن لبستين وطمدتين ، وفسرتا في الحديث ، فقال : اللبستان : اشتغال الصائم وأن يحتبي الرجل وليس بين عورته والسما : حجاب . والطمدتان : الأكل بالشمال ، وأن يأكل منبطحا على بطنه⁴.

31-Four verses attributed to Hassān ibn Thābit.

وفي قصيدة حسان بن ثابت التي قالها يوم فتح مكة قال السهيلي : وفي هذه

1- Ibid, p. 573. cf p. 122 above.

2- Ibid, vol. 7, p. 87.

3- Ibid, p. 108.

4- Ibid, pp. 144- 145.

القصيدة : مودها كداء¹، وفي رواية الشيباني :

يسيل بها كدى أو كداء .

وزاد الشيباني في روايته أبياتا في هذه القصيدة، وهي :

وهاجت دون قتل بني لوى جذيمة ، إن قتلهم شقاء
وحلف الحارث بن أبي ضرار، وحلف قريظة فينا سواء
أولئك معشر ألبوا علينا ، ففي أظفارنا منهم دماء
ستبصر كيف نفعل يا ابن حرب بمولك الذين هم الرداء².

32- The reason for the raid on Tabūk.

وفي خبر غزوة تبوك قال السهيلي : وذكر يونس بأثر حديث الجد بن قيس³ عن عبد الحميد بن بهرام عن شهر بن حوشب عن عبد الرحمن ابن غنم أن اليهود أتوا النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - يوما ، فقالوا : يا أبا القاسم ، إن كنت صادقا أتك نبي فالحق بالشام ، فإن الشام أرض المحشر وأرض الأنبياء ، فصدق النبي صلعم ما قالوا ، فغزا غزوة تبوك لا يريد إلا الشام . فلما بلغ أنزل الله تعالى عليه آيات من سورة بني اسرائيل بعدما ختمت السورة : (وإن كنوا ليستغفزونك من الأرض ، ليخرجوك منها ، وإذا لا يلبثون خلافاك ٠٠٠) الى قوله : (تحويلا - الإسراء : ٧٦ ، ٧٧) . فأمره بالرجوع الى المدينة ، وقال : فيها محياك ، وفيها مماتك ، ومنها تبعث ، ثم قال : (أقم الصلاة لدلوك الشمس) الى قوله : (محمودا) (الإسراء : ٧٨ ، ٧٩) ، فرجع النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ، فأمره جبريل ، فقال : سل ربك ، فإن لكل نبي مسألة ، وكان جبريل عليه السلام له ناصحا ، وكان محمد صلعم له مطيعا ، فقال : ما تأمرني أن أسأل ؟ قال : (وقل ربّي أدخلني مدخل

1- Ibid, p. 119.

2- Ibid, p. 153.

3- Ibid, p. 305.

صدق، وأخرجني مخرج صدق، واجعل لي من لدنك سلطانا نصيرا .
وهؤلاء نزلن عليه في رجعتهم من تبوك¹.

33- Pertaining to the account of the men known as
the weepers, al-Bakkā'ūn.

وحول قصة البكائيين² قال السهيلي : وفي رواية يونس : أن عتبة خرج
من الليل فصلّى ما شاء الله، ثم بكى، وقال : " اللهم إني قد أمرت
بالجهاد، ورغبت فيه، ثم لم تجعل عندي ما أتقوى به مع رسولك ولم
تجعل في يد رسولك ما يحمّني عليه، وإني أتصدّق على كلّ مسلم بكلّ
مظلمة أصابني بها في مال أو جدّ أو عرض . " ثم أصبح مع الناس،
وقال النبيّ - صلعم - : أين المتصدّق في هذه الليلة ؟ فلم يبق أحد،
ثم قال : أين المتصدّق في هذه الليلة ؟ فليقم، ولا يتزاهد ما صنع هذه
الليلة . فقام إليه، فأخبره . فقال النبيّ - صلعم - : أبشر، فوالذي نفس
محمد بيده، لقد كتب في الزكاة المتقبّلة . وأما سالم بن عمير وعبد
الله بن المغفل، فرآهما يامين بن كعب يبيكان، فزودهما، وحملهما،
فلحقا بالنبيّ - صلعم - .³

34- The name of Musaylama's ex-wife.

وفي خبر امرأة مسيلمة قال السهيلي : والصواب ما قاله ابن اسحاق أن
اسم تلك المرأة زينب بنت الحارث، كذا وقع في رواية يونس عن ابن
اسحاق⁴.

35- The death of Mas'ūd al-Ansī.

وفي خبر مسعود العنسي قال السهيلي : وزاد ابن اسحاق في رواية

1- Ibid, pp. 359-360.

2- Ibid, p. 307.

3- Ibid, pp. 365-366. cf p. 307.

4- Ibid, p. 445. cf p. 400.

يونس عنه أن امرأته سقته البنج في شرايه تلك الليلة، وهي التي احتفرت السرب للدخول عليه، وكان اغتصبها، لأنها كانت من أجمل النساء، وكانت مسلعة صالحة، وكانت تحدث عنه أنه لا يفتمل من الجناية، واسمها¹ المرزبانة.

36- Pertaining to the death of the Prophet.

وقال : وروى يونس بن بكير في السيرة أن أم سلمة قالت : وضعت يدي على صدر رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - وهو ميت، فمرت عليّ جمع لا أكل ولا أتوصاً إلا وجدت ريح المسك من يدي، وفي روايته أيضاً أن علياً نودى، وهو يفسله أن ارفع طرفك إلى السماء . وفيها أيضاً أن علياً والفضل حين انتهيا في الغسل إلى أسفله سمعا مناديا يقول : لا تكشفا عورة نبيكم طيه السلام².

37- Quraysh challenges the Prophet to transform the mountain al-Safā into gold.

قال : وقد ذكر ابن اسحاق في غير هذه الرواية أنهم سألوا أن يجعل لهم الصفا ذهباً، فهم رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أن يدعو الله لهم، فنزل جبريل، فقال لهم : ما شئتم إن شئتم فعلت ما سألتم، ثم لا تلبثكم إن كذبتهم بعد معاينة الآية، فقالوا : لا حاجة لنا بها³.

38- Pertaining to the account of Umm Ma'bad.

وفي حديث أم معبد أضاف السهيلي أربعة أبيات للقصيدة التي نسبت إلى رجل من الجن، حيث أورد منها ابن اسحاق ثلاثة أبيات، وكذلك فعل السهيلي . إلا أن بها بعض الاختلافات الطفيفة . قال بعدها :

1- Ibid, p. 446.

2- Ibid, p. 582.

3- Ibid, vol. 3, pp. 153-154.

فياقصي ما روى الله عنكم به من فعال لا يجازى وسود
سلوا اختكم من شأنها وإيائها فإتكم إن تسألوا الشاة تشهد
دعاهها بشاة حائل، فتحلبت له بصريح ضرة الشاة مزيد
فنادرها رهنا لديها بحالب يرددها في صدر ثم مورد¹

ثم قال : ويروى أن حسان بن ثابت لما بلغه شعر الجني قال يجيبه ٠٠ ثم
أورد ثمانية أبيات² . وقد سقط حديث أم معبد بتمامه من الرواية الحالية .

39- The name of the she-camel the Prophet bought from
Abū Bakr.

وقال : وذكر ابن اسحاق (في غير رواية ابن هشام) أن الناقة التي ابتاعها
الرسول من أبي بكر يومئذ هي ناقته التي تسقى بالجدعاء ، وهي غير العضباء
التي جاء فيها الحديث³.

40- Bilal's poetry on killing of Umayya ibn Khalaf.

وقال : وذكر قتل بلال لأمية بن خلف ، ولم يذكر شعره في ذلك، وذكره
ابن اسحاق في غير هذه الرواية ، وهو :

فلما التقينا لم نكدب بحملة طيهم بأسيا ف لنا كالعقائق
ومطرورة حمر الظباء ، كأنها اذا رفعت أشطان ذات الأبارق
بني جمع قد حل قمص بشيخكم على ماء بدر رأس كل منافق
هجمنا عليه الموت واشتجرت به صاليت للأنصار غير زواحق⁴
هو حين لا قانا وفرق جمعه على وجهه في النار من رأس حالق

41- Pertaining to the account of Badr.

1- Ibid, vol. 4, p. 220.

2- Ibid, pp. 221- 222.

3- Ibid, p. 205.

4- Ibid, vol. 5, p. 201.

وقال : وكنوا يعرفون قتلى الملائكة من قتلاهم بآثار سود في الأعناق وفي البنان . كذلك ذكر ابن اسحاق في غير هذه الرواية .¹
وقال : وكان الرجل يرى الملك على صورة رجل يعرفه ، وهو يشبهه ويقول له : ما هم بشيء ، نكر عليهم . وهذا في معنى قوله سبحانه : (فثبتوا الذين آمنوا) . ذكره ابن اسحاق في غير رواية ابن هشام .²

42- Related to the day of Uhud.

وقال : ووقع في غير هذه الرواية أن ريحا هبت يوم أحد ، فسمعوا قائلاً يقول :

لا سيف إلا ذو الفقار ، ولا فتى إلا علي³

في أبيات ذكرها . وذكر ابن اسحاق أيضاً من غير رواية البكائي قول علي⁴ لفاطمة حين غسلت سيفه من الدم :
أفاطم هاتي السيف غير زميم فلست برديد ، ولا بلثيم

43- The Prophet's account of the martyrs.

وقال السهيلي : ومما وقع في السيرة أيضاً ولم يذكره ابن هشام حديث رواه ابن اسحاق ، قال : حدثني اسحاق بن عبد الله بن أبي فروة ، قال : حدثني بعض أهل العلم أن رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال : الشهداء ثلاثة ، فأدنى الشهداء عند الله منزلة رجل خرج مسوداً بنفسه ورحله ، لا يريد أن يقتل ولا يقتل أثناء سهم فأصابه ، قال : فأول قطرة تقطر من دمه ، يغفر الله بها ما تقدم من ذنبه ، ثم يهبط الله إليه جسداً من السماء ، فيجعل فيه روحه ، ثم يصعد به إلى الله ، فإذا انتهى به إليه وقع ساجداً ، ثم يؤمر به فيكسى سبعين زوجاً من

1- Ibid, p. 232.

2- Ibid, p. 241.

3- Ibid, vol. 6, p. 48. cf. p. 26.

4- Ibid, p. 48.

الاستبرق، ثم يقول رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - : كَأَحْسَنَ مَا رَأَيْتُمْ
مِنْ شَقَائِقِ النِّعَمَانِ . وَحَدَّثَ كَعْبُ الْأَحْبَارِ عَنْ قَوْلِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ
فَقَالَ كَعْبُ الْأَحْبَارِ : أَجَلَ كَأَحْسَنَ مَا رَأَيْتُمْ مِنْ شَقَائِقِ النِّعَمَانِ ، ثُمَّ يَقُولُ :
اذْهَبُوا بِهِ إِلَى إِخْوَانِهِ مِنَ الشَّهَدَاءِ ، فَاجْعَلُوهُ مَعَهُمْ ، فَيُوتَى بِهِ إِلَيْهِمْ
مِنْ قَبَةِ خَضِرَاءَ فِي رَوْضَةِ خَضِرَاءَ عِنْدَ بَابِ الْجَنَّةِ يُخْرِجُ عَلَيْهِمْ حُوتَ وَشَّوْرٍ
مِنْ الْجَنَّةِ لَعْدَائِهِمْ ، فَيَلْعَبَانِ لَهُمْ ، حَتَّى إِذَا كَثُرَ حَبِيبُهُمْ مِنْهُمَا طَعَنَ الثَّوْرُ
الْحُوتَ بِقَرْنِهِ ، فَيَقْوَى لَهُمْ عَمَّا يَدْعُونَ . ثُمَّ يَرْوِحَانِ عَلَيْهِمْ لَعْنَاتِهِمْ ،
فَيَلْعَبَانِ لَهُمْ ، حَتَّى إِذَا كَثُرَ حَبِيبُهُمْ مِنْهُمَا ضَرَبَ الْحُوتُ الثَّوْرَ بِذَنْبِهِ ، فَيَقْوَى
لَهُمْ عَمَّا يَدْعُونَ ، فَإِذَا انْتَهَى إِلَى إِخْوَانِهِ سَأَلُوهُ (كَمَا) تَسْأَلُونَ الرَّاكِبَ
يَقْدُمُ عَلَيْهِمْ بِلَادَكُمْ ، فَيَقُولُونَ : مَا فَعَلَ فُلَانٌ ؟ فَيَقُولُ : أَفْلَسَ . فَيَقُولُونَ :
فَمَا أَهْلَكَ مَالَهُ ، فَوَاللَّهِ إِنْ كَانَ لَكُنِيًّا جُمُوعٌ تَاجِرًا ؟ فَيَقَالُ لَهُمْ : إِنَّا
لَا نَعُدُّ الْفُلْسَ مَا تَعُدُّونَ ، وَإِنَّمَا نَعُدُّ الْفُلْسَ مِنَ الْأَعْمَالِ ، فَمَا فَعَلَ فُلَانٌ
وَأَمْرَاتُهُ فَلَانَةٌ ؟ فَيَقُولُ : طَلَّقَهَا ، فَيَقُولُونَ : فَمَا الَّذِي نَزَلَ بَيْنَهُمَا حَتَّى
طَلَّقَهَا ، فَوَاللَّهِ إِنْ كَانَ بِهَا لَمُعْجِبًا ؟ فَيَقُولُونَ : مَا فَعَلَ فُلَانٌ ؟ فَيَقُولُ : مَاتَ
أَيَّامَاتٌ قَبْلَ بَزْمَانٍ ، فَيَقُولُونَ : هَلَكَ وَاللَّهِ ، مَا سَمِعْنَا لَهُ بِذِكْرٍ ، إِنْ لِلَّهِ
طَرِيقَيْنِ ، أَحَدُهُمَا طِينًا ، وَالْآخَرُ يَخَالِفُ بِهِ عَنَّا . فَإِذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِعَبْدٍ
خَيْرًا أَمَرَّ بِهِ طِينًا فَعَرَفْنَاهُ ، وَعَرَفْنَا حَتَّى مَاتَ ، وَإِذَا أَرَادَ اللَّهُ بِعَبْدٍ
شَرًّا خَوَّلَفَ بِهِ عَنَّا ، فَلَمْ نَسْمَعْ لَهُ بِذِكْرٍ . هَلَكَ وَاللَّهِ فُلَانٌ ، فَإِنَّ هَذَا
لَأَدْنَى الشَّهَدَاءِ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ مَتْرَظَةٌ . وَإِنَّ الْآخَرَ رَجُلٌ خَرَجَ مَسُودًا بِنَفْسِهِ
وَرَحْلَهُ ، يُحِبُّ أَنْ يَقْتُلَ وَلَا يُقْتَلَ ، أَتَاهُ سَهْمٌ غَرِبَ فَأَصَابَهُ ، فَذَلِكَ رَفِيقُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ
خَلِيلِ الرَّحْمَنِ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ ، يَحْكُ رُكْبَتَاهُ رُكْبَتَيْهِ . وَأَفْضَلُ الشَّهَدَاءِ رَجُلٌ خَرَجَ
مَسُودًا بِنَفْسِهِ وَرَحْلَهُ ، يُحِبُّ أَنْ يَقْتُلَ وَأَنْ يُقْتَلَ ، وَقَاتَلَ حَتَّى قَتَلَ قَعَصًا ،
فَذَلِكَ يَبْعَثُهُ اللَّهُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ شَاهِرًا سَيْفَهُ ، يَتَمَتَّى عَلَى اللَّهِ ، لَا يَسْأَلُهُ
شَيْئًا إِلَّا أُعْطِيَ .

44- Ali's combat with 'Amr ibn Udd al-Āmirī.

وحول مبارزة ابن أد لعليّ (بن أبي طالب) قال السهيلي : ووقع في
منازى ابن اسحاق من غير رواية ابن هشام عن البكائي فيها زيادة حسنة
رأيت أن أورها هنا تكميلاً للخير :

قال ابن اسحاق : إن عمرو بن آد خرج فنادى : هل من مبارز؟
فقام عليّ - رضي الله عنه - وهو مقتنع بالحديد ، فقال : أنا له يابني الله ،
فقال : إني عمرو ، اجلس . ونادى عمرو : ألا رجل ؟ ! يوتئهم ، ويقول :
أين جئتكم التي تزعمون أنه من قتل منكم دخلها ؟ ! أفلا تبرزون لي رجلاً ؟ !
فقام عليّ ، فقال : أنا يارسول الله . فقال : اجلس ، إني عمرو . ثم نادى
الثالثة ، وقال :

ولقد بحثت من النداء • بجمعكم : هل من مبارز؟
ووقفت ، إذ جبن المشج • مع ، موقف القرن المناجز
وكذاك إني لم أزل • متسرط قبل الهزاهز
إن الشجاعة في الفتى • والجود من خير الغرائز
فقام عليّ ، فقال : يارسول الله ، أنا له • فقال : إني عمرو . فقال : وإن كان
عسراً • فأذن له النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - فمشى إليه عليّ ، حتى أتاه ،
وهو يقول :

لا تعجلن ، فقد أنا • ك مجيب صوتك غير طعز
ذونية وبصيرة ، • والصدق منجى كلّ فائز
إني لأرجو أن أقي • م عليك نائحة الجنائز
من ضربة نجلاء يب • قى ذكرها عند الهزاهز

فقال له عمرو : من أنت ؟ قال : أنا عليّ . قال : ابن عبد مناف ؟ فقال :
أنا عليّ بن أبي طالب . فقال : غيرك ، يا ابن أخي ، من أعاصمك من هو
أسن منك ، فإني أكره أن أهريق دمك . فقال له عليّ - رضي الله عنه -

ولكنني، والله، لا أكره أن أهرق دمك . فغضب، ونزل، فسل سيفه، كانه
شعلة نار . ثم أقبل نحو علي مغضبا . وذكر أنه كان على فرسه . فقال
له علي : كيف أقاتلك، وأنت على فرسك ؟ ولكن انزل معي . فنزل عن فرسه،
ثم أقبل نحو علي، واستقبله علي - رضي الله عنه - بدارقه، فضربه عرو
فيها، ففقدها وأثبت فيها السيف، وأصاب رأسه، فشجه ؛ وضربه علي على جبل
العاتق، فسقط، وثار العجاج، وسمع النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - التكبير،
فعرف أن عليا - رضي الله عنه - قد قتله . فثم يقول علي - رضي الله عنه - :

أعلي تقحم الفوارس هكذا عني، وعنه آخروا أصحابي
فاليوم تمنعني الفرار حفيظتي ومصم في الرأس ليس بنابي
أدى عير حين أخلص صقله صافي الحديد، يستفيض ثوابي
فغدوت ألتصم القراع بمرهف غضب مع البتراء في أقرب
قال ابن عبد، حين شدّ أليّة، وحلفت، فاستمعوا من الكذاب
ألا يفرّ، ولا يهتلّ، فالتقى رجلا، يلتقيان كلّ ضراب

وبعده : نصر العبارة¹، إلى آخر الأبيات . . . ثم أقبل نحو النبي - صلى
الله عليه وسلم - وهو متهلّل، فقال له عمر بن الخطاب - رضي الله عنه - :
هلا سلبته درعه، فانه ليس في العرب درع خير منها ؟ فقال : إني حين
ضربته استقبلني بسرواته، فاستحييت، ابن عبي، أن استلبه . وخرجت خيلهم
منهزمة حتى اقتحمت الخندق هاربة²

45- The names of the slaves besieged in al-Tā'if and
freed by the Prophet on accepting Islam.

وقال السهيلي : وذكر العبيد الذين نزلوا من حصن الطائف، ولم يسلمهم
ومنهم أبو بكر بن نفيح بن مسروح تدلّى من سور الطائف على بكره، فكنتي أبا

1- Ibid, p. 273.

2- Ibid, pp. 316-319.

بكثرة، وهو من أفاضل الصحابة، ومات بالبصرة، ومنهم الأزرق، وكان عبدا للحارث بن كدة المتطّيب، وهو زوج سمّية مولاة الحارث أمّ زياد بن أبي سفيان، وأمّ مسلمة بن الأزرق، وبنو مسلمة بن الأزرق، ولهم صيت وذكر بالعديّة، وقد انتسبوا الى غسان ٠٠٠ ومن أولئك العبيد : المبعث، وكان اسمه الضجع المضطجع، فبدّل النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - اسمه ٠ وكان عبدا لعثمان بن طمر بن معتب ٠ ومنهم يحدث التّبال، وكان عبدا لبعض آل يسار ٠ ومنهم وردان جدّ الفرات بن زيد بن وردان، وكان لعبد الله بن ربيعة بن خرشة، وإبراهيم بن جابر، وكان أيضا لخرشة ٠ وجعل النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - ولاء هؤلاء العبيد لسادتهم، حين أسلموا ٠ كلّ هذا ذكره ابن اسحاق في غير رواية ابن هشام¹.

46- Pertaining to the account of Dhū al-Qarnayn.

والسهيلي قد ينقل أحيانا عن يونس دون ذكره ٠ فعثلا : بشأن ذي القرنين قال السهيلي : وأصحّ ما جاء في ذلك ما روى عن أبي الطفيل عامر بن واثلة ؟ قال : سألت ابن الكواء عليّ بن أبي طالب، فقال : أرايت ذا القرنين، أنبيّا كان أم ملكا ؟ فقال : لا نبيّا كان ولا ملكا، ولكن كان عبدا صالحا دطّ قومه الى عبادة الله، فضربوه على قرني رأسه ضربتين، فيكم مثله (يعني نفسه)²؛ زادها السهيلي ٠ والخبر في رواية يونس كما قال السهيلي، إلّا انه قال : كان عبدا صالحا، أحبّ الله وأحبّه، وناصح الله، فنصحه، فضرب على قرنيه الأيمن فعات، ثم بعثه، ثم ضرب على قرنيه الأيسر فعات، وفيكم مثله³.

1- *Ibid*, vol. 7, p. 275.

2- *Ibid*, vol. 3, p. 178.

3- *Yūnus*, p. 185/pas. p. 261.

47- The black stone.

وكذلك ذكر أن الحجر الأسود كان ياقوتة، وكان أبيض مضيئاً سودته ذنوب الناس.¹ والخبر في رواية يونس². وفي خبر الكعبة أورد السهيلي كذلك خبر إخراج الحجر لإبراهيم (عليه السلام) حين بناء الكعبة من جبل قبيس، قال: دلّه عليه الله³. وقال يونس: أتاه جبريل، فأخرجه له⁴. وكذلك ذكر إيداع الحجر في جبل أبي قبيس⁵ وهو مذكور في يونس⁶.

48- Asīd or Usayd.

وفي الحديث عن إسلام أسيد بن سعية قال السهيلي: وأما أسيد بن سعية، فقال إبراهيم بن سعد بن إبراهيم بن عبد الرحمن بن عوف العدني، عن ابن اسحاق، وهو أحد رواة العناري عنه (أخذ) أسيد بن سعية (بضم الألف)، وقال يونس بن بكير عن ابن اسحاق، وهو قول الواقدي وغيره: أسيد، بفتحها. قال الدارقطني: وهذا هو الصواب، ولا يصح ما قاله إبراهيم بن ابن اسحاق⁷.
أما في نسخة يونس⁸ فقد ورد الاسم بغير شكل، ويمكن أن يقرأ بالطريقتين، إلا أن كلام السهيلي يوحي بغير ذلك. وكذلك وقع أسيد في رواية البيهقي⁹.

49- The lineage of the mother of Khadīja.

وفي نسب أم خديجة (بنت خويلد) قال السهيلي بعد نسب قلابة وأما أمية¹⁰ بنت عامر بن الحارث بن فهر، وهو خطأ إذ أنه قد ترك ثلاثة

1- Text, vol. 2, p. 273.

2- Yūnus, p. 74/pas 85.

3- Text, vol. 2, p. 275.

4-Yūnus, p. 75/pas 86.

5- Text, vol. 2, p. 270

6- Yūnus, op. cit.

7- Text, vol.2, p. 330.

8- Yūnus, p. 64/pas 65.

9- Text, vol.1, p.431.

10-Text, vol.2, p. 245.

أسطر، ثم نقل ما بعدها . ويرجع ذلك الى تشابه نهايات الأسطر ،
وانما الصحيح في رواية يونس¹ : وأما طتكة ابنة عبد العزى بن قصي
وأما ريطة ابنة كعب بن سعد بن تميم بن مرة بن كعب بن لوى ،
وأما قيلة ابنة حذافة بن جمح بن عمرو بن هميم بن كعب بن
لوى . ثم قال : وأما أمية ابنة طمر بن الحارث بن فهر . وقد
ورد خطأ اسم قلابة (فلانة) ، والصحيح ما قال السهيلي، وهو قول
ابن هشام كذلك . وقد ورد كذلك اسم أخت ورقة بن نوفل في
رواية يونس الحالية (أم قبالة) ، وهو حسب قول السهيلي (أم
قتال)³ . وكذلك سماها البيهقي⁴ .

50- The punishment of Abū Tālib.

وقد ورد في شأن أبي طالب أن الرسول - صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال :
لعله تنفعه شفاعتي يوم القيامة ، فيجعل في ضحاح من النار يبلغ
كعبيه يغلى منه دماغه . قال السهيلي الذي أورد الحديث : وفي
رواية يونس عن ابن اسحاق زيادة ، وهو أنه قال : يغلى منها
دماغه حتى يسيل على قدميه : وفي رواية يونس الحديث ليس من رواية
ابن اسحاق ، وإنما هو عن سنان بن اسماعيل الدنقي عن يزيد
الرقاشي ، قال : قيل لرسول الله - صلعم - يا رسول الله ، أبو طالب
ونصرته لك ، وحيطته عليك ، أين منزلته ؟ فقال رسول الله - صلعم - :
هو في ضحاح من نار . فقليل : وإن فيها لضحاحا وغمرا ؟ فقال
رسول الله (صلعم) : نعم ، إن أدنى أهل النار منزلة لمن يحذى له

1- Yūnus, p. 60/pas 58. cf. p.76 above.

2- Ibid, p. 20/pas 25.

3- Text, vol. 2, p. 142.

4- Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa, vol. 1, p. 41.

نعلان من نار يغلى من وهجهما دماغه حتى يسيل على قوائمه .
ومما هو واضح أنّ العذاب الذى ذكره السهيلي غير مرتبط بأبي
طالب ، وإنما هو عام فيمن هذا حاله ¹.

1- Text, vol. 4, p. 28, cf. Yūnus, p. 223/pas 329.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ^CAbd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad, Sharḥ al-Usūl al-Khamsa, ed. ^CAbd al-Karīm ^CUthmān (Cairo, 1965).
- ^CAbd al-Raḥmān al-Tāhīr, (ed.) Tafsīr Mujāhid (Beirut, n.d.).
- Abū Dā'ūd, Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath, al-Sunan, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ^CAbd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo, 1951).
- Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, al-Imtā' wa al-Mu'ānasa, ed. Aḥmad Amīn and Aḥmad al-Zayn (Beirut, n.d.).
- Abū ^CUbayda Ma^Cmar ibn al-Muthanna, Majāz al-Qur'ān, ed. Muḥammad Fu'ād Sarkīs (Beirut, n.d.).
- Abū ^CUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, Kitāb al-Amwāl, ed. Muḥammad Khalīl Harrās (Cairo, 1975).
- ^CAlī, ^CAbd Allāh Yūsuf, The Glorious Qur'ān, Translation and Commentary, (Riyadh, n.d.).
- al-Ash'arī, ^CAlī ibn Ismā'īl, al-Ibāna 'an Usūl al-Diyāna (Cairo, 1348 A.H.).
- Kitāb al-luma^C ed. Hamoda Zaki (Cairo, 1955).
- al-^CAskarī, al-Ḥasan ibn ^CAbd Allāh, al-Awā'il, ed. Muḥammad al-Miṣrī and Walīd Qaṣṣāb (Damascus, 1975).
- al-A^Czamī, (ed.), Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, Maghāzī Rasūl Allāh li ^CUrwa ibn al-Zubayr (Riyadh, 1401/1981).
- al-Azraqī, Muḥammad ibn ^CAbd Allāh, Akhbār Makka wa mā jā' fīhā min al-Athār, ed. Rushdī al-Ṣāliḥ (published by Dār al-Andalus, n.d.).
- al-Baghdādī, ^CAbd al-Qāhir, al-Farq bayn al-Fīraq (Beirut, 1973).
- al-Bakrī, ^CAbd Allāh ibn ^CAbd al-^CAzīz, Mu^Cjam mā Ista^Cjam min Asmā' al-Bilād wa al-Mawādi^C, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā (Cairo, 1945-51).
- al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad ibn Yahyā, Futūḥ al-Buldān, ed. ^CAbd Allāh and ^CUmar Anīs al-Ṭabba^C (Beirut, 1957).
- Ansāb al-Ashraf, ed. Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allāh (Cairo, 1959).
- al-Bāqillānī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭayyib, al-Tamhīd, ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Khuḍayrī and Muḥammad ^CAbd al-Ḥādī Abū Rayda (Cairo, 1947/1366).
- al-Bayhaqī, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn, Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa wa Ma^Crifat Ahwāl Ṣāhib al-Sharī'a (Cairo, 1970).
- Bell, Richard, The Qur'an, (Edinburgh, 1939).

- Brönnle (ed.) Paul, Commentary on Ibn Hishām's Biography of Muḥammad according to Abū Dharr's MSS (Cairo, 1911).
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, The Saḥīḥ, ed. Muḥammad Muslim Khān (Medina, 1976-77).
- Kitāb al-Du'afā' al-Saghīr, ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid (Halab, 1396 A.H.).
- Burton, John, The Collection of the Qur'ān, Cambridge at the University Press (Cambridge, 1977).
- al-Dā'ūdī, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī, Tabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad 'Umar (Cairo, 1972).
- al-Dhahabī, Muḥammad, Tadhkirat al-Huffāz, ed. Osmania Oriental Publications Bureau (Hayderabad, 1955).
- al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid (I,II) and Fu'ād al-Sayyid (III,IV) (Kuwait, 1960-63).
- Mizān al-'Itidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl, ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī (Cairo, 1963).
- Siyar A'lam al-Nubalā', ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid (I), Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī (II) (Cairo, 1957).
- Fārūq Hamāda, Masādir al-Sīra al-Nabawiyya wa Taqwīmuḥa (Morocco, 1980/1400).
- al-Ghazālī, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, Ihyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn (Cairo, 1967).
- al-Mustasfā min 'Ilm al-Usūl, vol.I (Cairo, 1322 A.H.); vol.II (Cairo, 1937/1356).
- Jawāhir al-Qur'ān (Cairo, 1933).
- al-Iqtisād fī al-'Itiqād (Cairo, 1320 A.H.).
- Goldziher, Ignaz, Muslim Studies, ed. S.M. Stern, trans. C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern (London, 1968).
- Guillaume, Alfred, The Life of Muḥammad, Oxford at the University Press (Oxford, 1978).
- New Light on the Life of Muḥammad, Manchester at the University Press (Manchester, n.d.)
- Ḥājī Khalīfa, Kashf al-Zunūn 'an Asāmi al-Kutub wa al-Funūn, ed. Muḥammad Sharaf al-Dīn Yaltaqāya and Rif'at Bīlka al-Kalīsī (Istanbul, 1941).

- al-Ḥamawī, Yāqūt, Kitāb Irshād al-Arīb ilā Ma^crifat al-Adīb, known as Mu^cjam al-Udabā', ed. D.S. Margoliouth as Yāqūt's Dictionary of Learned Men (Cairo, 1923-31).
- Ḥamīd Allāh, Muḥammad, Sīrat Ibn Ishāq al-Musammāh bi-Kitāb al-Mubtada' wa al-Mab^cath wa al-Maghāzī. "A Life of the Prophet Muḥammad, according to Yūnus MS" (Morocco, 1976).
- Majmū^cat al-Wathā'iq al-Siyāsiyya li al-^cAhd al-Nabawī wa al-Khilāfa al-Rāshida (Beirut, 1389/1969).
- Horovitz, Josef, "THE EARLIEST BIOGRAPHIES OF THE PROPHET AND THEIR AUTHORS", ISLAMIC CULTURE, Vol.I (1927) "pp.535-59"; vol.II (1928) "pp.22-50, 164-82, 415-526".
- Ibn al-Abbār, Muḥammad ibn ^cAbd Allāh, Kitāb al-Takmila li Kitāb al-Ṣila (Madrid, 1887).
- Ibn ^cAbd al-Barr, Yūsuf ibn ^cAbd Allāh, al-Istī^cāb fī Asmā' al-Ashāb, printed on the margin of al-Iṣāba (Cairo, 1328).
- Ibn ^cAqīl, ^cAbd Allāh, Sharḥ Alfiyyat Ibn Mālik (Cairo, 1956).
- Ibn al-^cArabī, Muḥammad ibn ^cAbd Allāh, al-^cAwāṣim min al-Qawāṣim, ed. ^cAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bādīs (Algeria, 1926/1345-1927/1346).
- Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Tirmidhī (Cairo, 1350/1931).
- Aḥkām al-Qur'ān, ed. ^cAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī (Beirut, n.d.).
- Ibn ^cAsākir, ^cAlī ibn al-Ḥasan, Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī (Damascus, 1347 A.H.).
- Ibn al-Athīr, ^cAlī ibn Muḥammad, al-Lubāb fī Tahdhīb al-Ansāb (Cairo, 1357).
- Ibn al-Athīr, al-Mubārak ibn Muḥammad, al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth wa al-Āthār, ed. Ṭāhir Aḥmad al-Zāwī and Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Ṭanājī (Cairo, 1383/1963).
- Ibn Bakkār, al-Zubayr, al-Akhbār al-Muwaffaqiyyāt, ed. Samī Makki (Baghdad, 1972).
- Ibn Bashkuwāl, Khalaf ibn ^cAbd al-Malik, Kitāb al-Ṣila (Madrid, 1883).
- Ibn Dihya, ^cUmar ibn al-Ḥasan, al-Mutrib min Ash^cār Ahl al-Maghrib, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī, Ḥamīd ^cAbd al-Majīd and Aḥmad Aḥmad Badawī, revised by Ṭāhā Ḥusayn (Cairo, 1954).
- Ibn Durayd, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, al-Ishtiqāq, ed. ^cAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Ḥārūn (Cairo, 1378/1958).

- Ibn Farḥūn, Ibrāhīm ibn^CAlī, al-Dībāj al-Mudhahhab fī Ma^Crifat A^Cyān al-Mudhahhab (Cairo, 1951).
- Ibn Ḥabīb, Muḥammad, Kitāb al-Muḥabbar, ed. Ilse Lichtenstädter (Beirut, n.d.).
- Ibn Ḥajar, Aḥmad ibn^CAlī, Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb (Hayderabad, 1325 A.H.).
- al-Isāba fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥāba (Cairo, 1328 A.H.).
- Fath al-Bārī bi Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (Cairo, 1348 A.H.).
- Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad, al-Musnad, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, 1955/1374).
- Ibn Ḥazm, ^CAlī ibn Aḥmad, al-Fiṣal fī al-Milal wa al-Ahwā' wa al-Niḥal (Cairo, 1317-21).
- al-Muḥallā (Beirut, 1352 A.H.).
- Jamḥart Ansāb al-^CArab, ed. ^CAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Ḥarūn (Cairo, 1971).
- al-Ihkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām (Cairo, 1346 A.H.).
- Jawāmi^C al-Sīra, ed. Iḥsān ^CAbbās and Nāsir al-Dīn al-Asad, revised by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, n.d.).
- Ibn Hibbān, Muḥammad, Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddithīn wa al-Du^Cafā', ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1396 A.H.).
- Ibn Hishām, Muḥammad ibn ^CAbd al-Malik, Sīrat Ibn Hishām, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā and others (Cairo, 1375).
- Ibn al-^CImād, ^CAbd al-Ḥayy, Shadharāt al-Dhahab fī Akhbār man Dhahab (Cairo, 1350).
- Ibn al-Jawzī, ^CAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ^CAlī, al-Muntazam fī Ta'rīkh al-Mulūk wa al-Umam (Hayderabad, 1359, A.H.).
- Ibn Khaldūn, ^CAbd al-Raḥmān, Kitāb al-^CIbar wa Diwān al-Mubtada' wa al-Khabar (n.p. n.d.).
- Ibn Khallikān, Aḥmad, Wafayāt al-A^Cyān wa Anbā' al-Zamān (Cairo, 1310 A.H.).
- Ibn Kathīr, Ismā^Cīl ibn ^CUmar, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya (Beirut, 1966).
- Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Karīm (Beirut, 1980).
- Qaṣaṣ al-Anbiyā' (Beirut, n.d.).
- Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Muḥammad ibn ^CAbd Allāh, al-Iḥāṭa fī Akhbār al-~~Q~~arnāta, ed. Muḥammad ^CAbd Allāh ^CInān (Cairo, 1973).
- Ibn Khayr al-Ishbilī, Muḥammad, Fihrist mā rawāhū ^Can Shuyūkhīhī (Spain, 1894).
- Ibn Khayyāt, Khalīfa, Ta'rīkh, ed. Zuhayr Zakkār (n.p. 1967).

- Ibn Maḍā', Aḥmad ibn ^ḥAbd al-Raḥmān, al-Radd ^ḥala al-Nuḥāt, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Banna (Cairo, 1399/1979).
- Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad, Lisān al-^ḥArab (Cairo, 1300-07 A.H.).
- Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, al-Fihrist (Cairo, 1348 A.H.).
- Ibn al-Qayyim, Muḥammad, al-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursala ^ḥala al-Jahmiyya wa al-Mu^ḥattila (Cairo, 1348).
- Zād al-Ma^ḥād fī Hady Khayr al-^ḥIbād (Beirut, n.d.).
- Badā'i^ḥ al-Fawā'id (Cairo, n.d.).
- Ibn Qutayba, ^ḥAbd Allāh ibn Muslim, al-Ma^ḥārif, ed. Tharwat ^ḥUkāsha (Cairo, 1969).
- al-Shi^ḥr wa al-Shu^ḥarā', ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, 1944-50).
- Kitāb Ta'wīl Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth (Cairo, 1966/1386).
- Ibn Rushd, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, Kitāb al-Muqaddimāt (Cairo, n.d.).
- Ibn Sa^ḥd, Muḥammad, Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā (Beirut, 1968).
- Ibn Sayyid al-Nās, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, ^ḥUyūn al-Athar fī Funūn al-Maghāzī wa al-Shamā'il wa al-Siyar (Cairo, 1356 A.H.).
- Ibn Sīrīn, Tafsīr al-Ahlām al-Kabīr (Beirut, 1982/1402).
- Ibn Taymiyya, Aḥmad Ibn ^ḥAbd al-Ḥalīm, Naqd al-Mantiq, ed. Muḥammad ^ḥAbd al-Rāziq Ḥamza and Sulaymān Ibn ^ḥAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ṣanī^ḥ (Cairo, 1370/1951).
- al-Radd ^ḥala al-Mantiqiyīn, ed. ^ḥAbd al-Ṣamad Sharf al-Dīn al-Kutubī (Bombay, 1368/1949).
- Majmū^ḥ Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyya, vol.III (Riyadh, 1381).
- al-Iṣbahānī, Abū Nu^ḥaym, Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa (Deccan, 1950).
- al-Iṣfahānī, ^ḥAli ibn al-Ḥusayn, Kitāb al-Aghānī (Cairo, n.d.).
- al-Jāhiz, ^ḥAmr ibn Bahr, al-Bayān wa al-Ṭabyīn, ed. Ḥasan al-Sandūbī (Cairo, 1351/1932).
- Jawād ^ḥAli, al-Mufaṣṣal fī Ta'rīkh al-^ḥArab qabl al-Islam (Beirut, 1971).
- Jeffery, Arthur, (ed.) Muqaddimatān fī ^ḥUlūm al-Qur'an (Cairo, 1972).
- al-Jumāhī, Muḥammad ibn Sallām, Ṭabaqāt Fuhūl al-Shu^ḥarā', ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, 1952).
- al-Juwaynī, ^ḥAbd al-Malik ibn ^ḥAbd Allāh, al-Irshād, ed. J.D. Luciani (Paris, 1938).
- al-Khaṭīb, Aḥmad, Ta'rīkh Baghdād (Cairo, 1931).
- Lane, E.W. An Arabic-English Lexicon (London, 1863-93).

- MacDonald, D.B., Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory (London, 1915).
- Mālik ibn Anas, al-Mudawwana al-Kubra (Cairo, 1323 A.H.).
- al-Muwatta', trans. by [°]Aisha [°]Abd al-Rahmān and Ya[°]qūb Johnson (Norwich, 1982).
- al-Māliqī, Abū al-Ḥasan, al-Martiba al-[°]Ulyā fī man yastahiqq al-Qadā' wa al-Futyā, ed. Levi Provencal (Cairo, 1948).
- al-Marākishī, [°]Abd al-Wāḥid, al-Mu[°]jib fī Talkhiṣ Akhbār al-Maghrib, ed. Muḥammad Sa[°]id al-[°]Uryān and Muḥammad al-[°]Arabī al-[°]Ilmī (Cairo, 1950).
- al-Mas[°]ūdī, [°]Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Murūj al-Dhahab wa Ma[°]adin al-Jawhar, ed. Yūsuf As[°]ad Dāghir (Beirut, 1978).
- al-Tanbīh wa al-Ishrāf, ed. [°]Abd Allāh Ismā[°]il al-Sāwī (Cairo 1938/1357).
- al-Māwardī, [°]Alī ibn Muḥammad, A[°]lām al-Nubuwwa (Beirut, 1973).
- MacCarthy, Richard, J., The Theology of al-Ash[°]arī (Beirut, 1952).
- "al-Bākillānī", Encyclopaedia of Islam (New Edition, 1960).
- al-Madānī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, Majma[°] al-Amthāl, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn [°]Abd al-Ḥamid (Cairo, 1955/1374).
- Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, al-Ṣaḥīḥ, trans. by [°]Abd al-Ḥamid Siddīqī (New Delhi, 1978).
- al-Nahḥās, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, I[°]rāb al-Qur'ān, ed. Zuhayr Ghāzī (Baghdad, 1977).
- al-Nasā'ī, Aḥmad, al-Sunan (Cairo, 1964).
- al-Qālī, Ismā[°]il ibn al-Qāsim, Kitāb al-Amālī (Cairo, 1344/1926).
- al-Qummī, Sa[°]d ibn [°]Abd Allāh, Kitāb al-Maḡalāt wa al-Firaq, ed. Muḥammad Jawād Mashkūr (Tehran, 1963).
- al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, al-Jāmi[°] lī Ahkām al-Qur'ān (Cairo, 1367/1948).
- Qutb, Sayyid, fī Zilāl al-Qur'ān, vol.30 (London, 1979).
- al-Rāzī, Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn, Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb (Cairo, 1324).
- Riḍā, Muḥammad Rashīd, Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Ḥakīm, known as Tafsīr al-Manār (Cairo, 1928/1347).
- al-Ṣafadī, Khalīl ibn Aybak, Nakt al-Himyān fī Nukat al-[°]Umyān. (n.d. n.p.).

- al-Shāfi^ī, Muḥammad ibn Idrīs, al-Umm (Cairo, 1321-26 A.H.).
- al-Risāla, ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, 1939).
- Ikhtilāf al-Hadīth, printed on the margin of al-Umm (vol. VII)
- al-Suhaylī, ^īAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ^īAbd Allāh, al-Rawd al-Unuf, ed. ^īAbd al-Raḥmān al Wakīl (Cairo, 1970).
- al-Ta^īrīf wa al-I^īlām bī mā Ubhima fī al-Qur'ān min al-Asmā' wa al-A^īlām, ed. Maḥmūd Rabī^ī (Cairo, 1938).
- Amālī al-Suhaylī fī al-Nahw wa al-Lugha wa al-Hadīth wa al-Fiqh, ed. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Bannā (Cairo, 1970).
- al-Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn, Bughyat al-Wu^īāt fī Tabaqāt al-Lughawiyīn wa al-Nuḥāt, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1965).
- al-Itqān fī ^īUlūm al-Qur'ān, ed. Muḥammad A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1387).
- al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad ibn Jarīr, Ta'rikh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1960).
- Jāmi^ī al-Bayān ^īan Tafsīr^ī al-Qur'ān (Cairo, 1388/1968).
- Ṭālibī, ^īAmmār, Arā' Abi Bakr ibn al-^īArabi al-Kalāmiyya (Beirut, 1974).
- al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad, al-Jāmi^ī al-Ṣaḥīḥ, known as Sunan al-Tirmidhī, ed. ^īAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ^īUthmān and ^īAbd al-Waḥhāb ^īAbd al-Laṭīf (Medina, 1394/1974).
- al-Shamā'il al-Muḥammadiyya, ed. ^īIzzat ^īUbayd al-Da^īās (Syria, 1397/1976).
- al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, al-Fihrist, ed. Maḥmūd Rāmyār (Persia, n.d.).
- Vidyarthi, ^īAbd al-Ḥaqq, Muḥammad in World Scriptures (Lahore, n.d.).
- al-Wāqidi, Muḥammad ibn ^īUmar, Kitāb al-Maghāzī, ed. Marsden Jones (London, 1966).
- Watt, W.M., Islamic Philosophy and Theology (Edinburgh, 1962).
- Muḥammad at Medina (Oxford, 1956).
- Muḥammad at Mecca (Oxford, 1953).
- al-Yaḥṣabī, ^īIyād ibn Mūsā, al-Shifā' bī Ta^īrīf Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā, incorporated with a commentary written on it by al-Shihāb al-Khafāji (Cairo, 1325 A.H.).
- al-Yazīdī, Muḥammad ibn al-^īAbbās, al-Amālī, ed. ^īAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Ḥaḍramī (Cairo, 1368).

- al-Zabī^hī, Muḥammad, Tāj al-^hArūs min Jawāhir al-Qāmūs, ed. ^hAli Hilālī, revised by ^hAbd Allāh al-^hAlāyī and ^hAbd al-Sattār Aḥmad Farrāj (Kuwait, 1386/1966).
- al-Zajjāj, Ibrāhīm ibn al-Sarrī, I^hrāb al-Qur'ān, ed. Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī (Cairo, 1963).
- Zakkār, Suhayl, al-Maghāzī al-Nabawiyya, according to the version of al-Zuhri (Syria, 1980).
- Kitāb al-Siyar wa al-Maghāzī lī Muḥammad ibn Ishāq al-Muṭṭalibī (Damascus, 1398/1978).
- al-Zamakhsharī, Jār Allāh, al-Kashshāf ^han Ghawāmiḍ al-Tanzīl (Beirut, 1366/1947).
- al-Zarqānī, Muḥammad ibn ^hAbd al-Bāqī, Sharḥ al-Mawāhib (Cairo, 1325).